

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4069. A bill to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; without amendment (Rept. No. 802). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4090. A bill to equalize retirement benefits among members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4091. A bill to ratify Act 237 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 4092. A bill to promote the safety and health of employees engaged in baggage, mail, or express-train service in interstate commerce by requiring common carriers by railroad and any express company to install and maintain all such cars and equipment used or furnished by them for such purposes in safe and suitable conditions for use in the service for which they are put; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 4093. A bill to reduce individual income tax payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 4094. A bill to forbid the interstate transportation of fireworks in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4095. A bill to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4096. A bill to direct the Secretary of War to prepare an honor roll of the names of United States citizens who died while serving in the Royal Air Force or the Flying Tigers during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

H. R. 4097. A bill to authorize commencement of an action by the United States to determine interstate water rights in the Colorado River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 4098. A bill to incorporate the American Division, Inc., World War II Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4099. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 4100. A bill to modify the requirements relating to lifesaving appliances on passenger vessels navigating the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 4101. A bill to authorize lump-sum payments to Air Corps Reserve officers who are selected for commission in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4102. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution to authorize commencement of an action by the United States to determine interstate water rights in the Colorado River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to amend section 304 of the Labor-Management Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to nondeductible income of recipients of old-age aid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation adequate to stamp out and abolish the evil of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4103. A bill for the relief of Charles M. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4104. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mark Shee Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H. R. 4105. A bill for the relief of Wpan Jan Loperny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

724. By Mr. COTTON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend the tax savings appertaining to the community-property system to all States of the Union; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

725. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the Board of Aldermen, Chelsea, Mass., urging immediate passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

726. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Missouri River States Committee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to flood control in the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

727. Also, petition of the International Telecommunications Conferences, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reaffirming warm friendship for the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

728. Also, petition of various citizens of the Sixth Congressional District, State of Washington, petitioning consideration of

their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 2716; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, July 7, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast made of one blood all kingdoms and tongues and peoples for to dwell together upon the face of the earth, today our thoughts go out across the seas to consider the welfare of peoples less fortunate than ourselves. Help Thy servants of this body to make a true and understanding appraisal of the tragic situation that affects our fellow men. Give us this day the wisdom that cometh down from above and is profitable to direct. Open our eyes that we may see all things in their right perspective. Keep our hearts sensitive and sympathetic to their needs, and according to our capacity may we share with generosity the bounties of our abundant life and the blessings of our free enterprise.

For our own dear land we pray that in humility and gratitude we may prove ever more worthy of Thy mercies, which are new every morning and fresh every evening.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 7, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On June 5, 1947:

S. 135. An act to legalize the admission into the United States of Frank Schindler.

On July 8, 1947:

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 665. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pre-

tenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho;

S. 686. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school buildings in Owyhee, Nev.;

S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate;

S. 816. An act to repeal the Post Roads Act of 1866, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946;

S. 1231. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1316. An act to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the issuance of certain public-improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 1421. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 811) for the relief of J. F. Powers.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3333. An act to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes; and

H. R. 3861. An act to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 107. An act for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 175. An act to confer upon the Governor of Alaska the power to pardon and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against laws of the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 187. An act to amend Public Law 304, Seventy-seventh Congress;

H. R. 205. An act to amend the act approved May 7, 1934, granting citizenship to the Metlakatla Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 734. An act to amend the act of February 12, 1925, and for other purposes;

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1180. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State;

H. R. 1260. An act to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 1337. An act authorizing a per capita payment of \$50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the transfer of the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the board of road commissioners in the Territory of Alaska to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1932;

H. R. 1609. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to provide for the exercise of zoning power in town sites on the public lands of the United States;

H. R. 1810. An act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankruptcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States;

H. R. 1938. An act to authorize the contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations of an amount equal to the moneys received by the Selective Service System for the services of persons assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940;

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service;

H. R. 2225. An act authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort McIntosh at Laredo, Tex., and certain personal property in connection therewith, without exchange of funds or reimbursement;

H. R. 2361. An act to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818;

H. R. 2484. An act to authorize the payment of certain sums to jobbers in connection with their logging of timber for the Menominee Indians on the Menominee Reservation during the logging season 1934-35, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2825. An act to provide additional funds for cooperation with public-school districts (organized and unorganized) in Mahanomen, Itasca, Pine, Becker, and Cass Counties, Minn., in the construction, improvement, and extension of school facilities to be available to both Indian and white children;

H. R. 2938. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 2956. An act to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended;

H. R. 3051. An act to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780; 34 U. S. C. 495a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503; 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft, known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3146. An act to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3153. An Act to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota;

H. R. 3173. An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary";

H. R. 3219. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3247. An act to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3322. An act to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3323. An act to enable the Osage Tribal Council to determine the bonus value of tracts offered for lease for oil, gas, and other mining purposes, Osage Mineral Reservation, Okla.;

H. R. 3343. An act to amend the Alaska game law;

H. R. 3350. An act relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3395. An act to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 3494. An act to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the Regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes;

H. R. 3505. An act authorizing an appropriation for investigating and rehabilitating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Mechant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre Spillway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3513. An act to transfer the Panama Railroad pension fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund;

H. R. 3539. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3555. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3569. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof;

H. R. 3598. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Pacific coast and creating the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission;

H. R. 3638. An act to amend section 10 of the act establishing a National Archives of the United States Government;

H.R. 3672. An act to create an Academic Advisory Board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy;

H.R. 3679. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds;

H.R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act;

H.R. 3759. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented and for other purposes;

H.R. 3767. A bill to provide for the protection, preservation, and extension of the sockeye salmon fishery of the Fraser River system, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3958. An act to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents and for taking action in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto; and

H.R. 4017. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 811. An act for the relief of J. F. Powers; and

H.R. 3861. An act to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the annual report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, covering operations during the year 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### LOUIS L. WILLIAMS, JR.

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Louis L. Williams, Jr. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the International Telecommunications Conference, at Atlantic City, N. J., reaffirming its warm friendship for the United States, and expressing deep appreciation for the great contributions made by the United States to the cause of democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Missouri River States Committee in meeting at Omaha, Nebr., relating to flood control in the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### COMMUNISTIC INFLUENCES IN THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION BY VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, DEPARTMENT OF IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, in these days of loose charges and countercharges, both in and out of Government, on the subject of Communistic influences in the United States, I was particularly pleased at the sound approach which has been voiced by the Department of Idaho, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The Idaho VFW, meeting recently at Pocatello, approved a firm resolution condemning witch hunts and overzealous individuals and groups which seek to smear Americans by calling them communistic or fascistic.

The authors of the resolution are two prominent members of the VFW in Idaho, Mr. Robert L. Summerfield, of Twin Falls, Idaho, a World War II veteran, and Axel Rosenlund, World War I veteran and former mayor of Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Idaho, in its regular State encampment in Pocatello, Idaho, on June 11, 1947, goes on record as endorsing the viewpoint of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on communism as expressed in his article on the subject published in the June 9, 1947, issue of the weekly magazine Newsweek.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Idaho, particularly endorses the following don'ts as set forth by Mr. Hoover:

1. Don't label anyone a Communist unless you have the facts.
2. Don't confuse liberals and progressives with Communists.
3. Don't be a party to the violation of the civil rights of anyone. When this is done you are playing directly in the hands of the Communists.
4. Don't let up on the fight against real Fascists, the Ku Klux Klan, and other dangerous groups.
5. Don't give aid and comfort to the Communist cause by joining front organizations, contributing to their campaign chests or by championing their cause in any way, shape, or form.
6. Don't fail to make democracy work with equal opportunity and the fullest enjoyment of every American's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; furthermore be it

*Resolved*, That it is the considered opinion of this organization that the most un-American

plified by "witch hunts" carried on in the name of patriotism. The appeal to patriotism has many times been the last refuge of all un-American activities are exponents of the world's greatest scoundrels. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Idaho, warns you to beware of those individuals who use race and religion as appeals to prejudice. The Veterans of Foreign Wars further warns you to beware of those who appeal to your patriotism and then call you Communist or Fascist because you disagree with their political opinions or ambitions.

The members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, all of whom tread foreign soil in the fight for democracy and Americanism condemn as un-American those character assassins who make unfounded charges of communism, fellow travelers, or fascism merely because of differing opinions on public affairs. The members of this organization are likewise unalterably opposed to communism, fascism, nazism, and all other "isms" with the one exception of Americanism.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 1512. A bill to improve accounting within the Federal Security Administration, to authorize intra-agency transfers and consolidations of appropriations by the Federal Security Administrator, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 451).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 929. A bill to amend section 2 of the act prescribing regulations for the Soldiers' Home located at Washington, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 564); without amendment (Rept. No. 452).

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 474. A bill for the relief of Samuel E. Belk; without amendment (Rept. No. 454).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 703. A bill to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors; with amendments (Rept. No. 455).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 739. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort McIntosh at Laredo, Tex., and certain personal property in connection therewith, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; without amendment (Rept. No. 456).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H.R. 2314. A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, and to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said acts to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates; without amendment (Rept. No. 457).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H.R. 3053. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 458).

H.R. 3056. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public-road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated

in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 459); and H. R. 3252. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 460).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Colonel William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 453):

By Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1293. A bill to enable the Veterans' Administration to provide housing units for certain disabled veterans of World War II; with amendments (Rept. No. 461).

By Mr. MALONE, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 418. A bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 462).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1578. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Adelia Charging Thunder a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1579. A bill for the relief of Damian Gandiaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1580. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Louise White Cloud Rhodd; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 1581. A bill to provide additional time to the city of Newark, N. J. for paying certain installments on the purchase price of the Port Newark Army Base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1582. A bill relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1583. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland, for the use of the University of Maryland, of the northern portion of a parcel of land previously constituting a part of the campus of the university and previously conveyed by the State of Maryland to the United States for the use of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. MACNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MALONE, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THYE, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1584. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to

promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1585. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BUTLER introduced Senate bill 1586, to prohibit the sale of grain and grain products by Government agencies to foreign purchasers for export, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

#### INVESTIGATION OF HIGH PRICES OF CONSUMER GOODS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) establishing a joint committee to investigate high prices of consumer goods, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PHILIP L. RICE TO BE JUDGE OF THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 15, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Rice is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired April 22, 1947. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. DONNELL), chairman, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MOORE), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. McCARRAN).

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking and Currency Committee may meet today at 2 o'clock and tomorrow at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE TOWNSEND CONVENTION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Townsend National Convention, Washington, D. C., June 28, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROPOSED TAX FOR THE SUPPORT OF LIQUOR CLINICS

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a statement by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, of Washington, D. C., before the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, on the subject of a proposal to tax liquor advertising for the support of liquor clinics, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a list of questions and answers relating to the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MISSOURI RIVER FLOODS—EDITORIAL FROM CHICAGO SUN

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the Missouri River floods which was published in the Chicago Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE—ANNUAL REPORT

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the annual report of Charles G. Bolte, retiring national chairman of the American Veterans' Committee, given at the organization's second annual convention in Milwaukee, Wis., on June 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NOMINATION OF JOE B. DOOLEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation is as follows: Under the order of the 2d instant the Senate, in executive session, will at this time resume the consideration of the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas, the time to be equally divided; from now to the hour of 4 o'clock, between those favoring and those opposed to the nomination, to be controlled, respectively, by the senior Senator from Texas (Mr. CONNALLY) and the junior Senator from Texas (Mr. O'DANIEL).

The Senate, in executive session, resumed the consideration of the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas (Mr. O'DANIEL) to recommit the nomination to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHERRY in the chair). Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. How many committees of the Senate are now sitting under permission from the Senate for the Members thereof to absent themselves from the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been informed by the Parliamentarian that one committee is now sitting, having obtained unanimous consent yesterday to sit today.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is only one committee sitting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the information the Chair has received from the Parliamentarian.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, an additional parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Presiding Officer ask the Parliamentarian to inform him where the Senators are who are not attending the committee meeting? Why can we not have a quorum present?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would suggest to the distinguished Senator that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CONNALLY. The inquiry refers to this parliament.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names, and a quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Forty-nine Senators may have answered, but they are not here now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas, who has been a Member of the Senate for many, many years and rendered very valuable service to the Senate, is well acquainted with the procedure which has now taken place in the Senate chamber.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Chair for his very complimentary reference to the "many, many, many years" of my service, but I have not been here that long. [Laughter.] I will say that, regardless of whether I know about the procedure which has taken place, when the Senate has important business to transact and only one committee is sitting under permission of the Senate, it is a grievous reflection on the United States Senate that there should be difficulty in obtaining a quorum and a greater difficulty in keeping one after it has been obtained.

The roll call, as completed for the Journal and the Record, disclosed the presence of 88 Senators, as follows:

|           |                 |                 |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Aiken     | Hawkes          | O'Connor        |
| Baldwin   | Hayden          | O'Daniel        |
| Ball      | Hickenlooper    | O'Mahoney       |
| Barkley   | Hill            | Overton         |
| Brewster  | Hoey            | Pepper          |
| Bricker   | Holland         | Reed            |
| Bridges   | Jenner          | Revercomb       |
| Brooks    | Johnson, Colo.  | Robertson, Va.  |
| Buck      | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson, Wyo. |
| Bushfield | Kem             | Russell         |
| Butler    | Kilgore         | Saltonstall     |
| Byrd      | Knowland        | Smith           |
| Cain      | Langer          | Sparkman        |
| Capehart  | Lodge           | Stewart         |
| Capper    | Lucas           | Taft            |
| Chavez    | McCarran        | Taylor          |
| Connally  | McCarthy        | Thomas, Okla.   |
| Cooper    | McClellan       | Thye            |
| Cordon    | McFarland       | Tydings         |
| Donnell   | McGrath         | Umstead         |
| Dworschak | McKellar        | Vandenberg      |
| Eaton     | McMahon         | Watkins         |
| Ellender  | Magnuson        | Wherry          |
| Ferguson  | Malone          | White           |
| Flanders  | Martin          | Wiley           |
| Fulbright | Millikin        | Williams        |
| George    | Moore           | Wilson          |
| Green     | Morse           | Young           |
| Gurney    | Murray          |                 |
| Hatch     | Myers           |                 |

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his immediate family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is unavoidably detained, the airplane on which he was to return to Washington today having been grounded because of adverse weather conditions.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, perhaps I am choosing an inappropriate time to make a unanimous-consent request, but I have been asked to request unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary now considering the Perlman nomination so-called, may be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to say that that committee is the very one which had charge of the matter which is now before the Senate. The members of that subcommittee are familiar with the issues here involved, and their advice ought to be made available to the Senate. Yet, the members of that subcommittee, with the sanction of the leadership, desire to absent themselves from the Senate in order to hold a meeting of the subcommittee. I shall not object, but I merely wished to make that comment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit the Chair to state the parliamentary situation?

Under the order entered on the 2d of July, the Senate is now in executive session, considering the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States judge for the northern district of Texas, and the time between the meeting of the Senate today and the hour of 4 p. m. today is equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the said nomination, and is controlled, respectively, by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to recommit the nomination to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and asks him if he will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Chair for his generosity, but I had not asked to be recognized. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to ask the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the majority leader, how long the committee is going to continue to investigate Mr. Perlman.

Mr. WHITE. I know nothing about the case. I have simply acted as intermediary. The request came to me from the chairman of the subcommittee, and I proffered the request to the Senate. I think that ends my responsibility in con-

nection with it. I know nothing about the particular matter under consideration by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the unanimous-consent request of the majority leader is granted.

To whom does the senior Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the pending question before the Senate is whether or not the Senate will advise and consent to the nomination of Mr. Dooley to be judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas.

I would not take the time of the Senate at this moment to explain my position unless I knew what I was talking about. I fully realize that the matter of making recommendations for appointments in the several States is something which should be left to the States.

The question which we are now considering is of extreme importance. I shall give the Senate what information I have concerning the qualifications of Mr. Dooley. This information has been obtained because it so happens that Amarillo, Tex., where Mr. Dooley practices law, is within a stone's throw of my State. As a matter of fact, the home of Mr. Dooley is closer to many parts of the State of New Mexico than it is to the capital of the State of Texas.

Mr. President, we all love good reputations. We want to feel that our neighbors bear good reputations. We in New Mexico know Mr. Dooley by reputation. We know him personally. He has practiced law in our State and is our neighbor. I would be doing a great injustice if I did not tell the Senate the reputation which he bears as a citizen of Texas and as a practicing attorney and other things which enter into his reputation among his neighbors.

It is very difficult for a Senator to vote against a nominee from another State who bears a fine reputation. In the few brief remarks which I shall make I have no idea of questioning the motives or intention of anyone from Texas who might object to Mr. Dooley. I wish I could agree with both Senators from Texas. However, knowing Mr. Dooley as I do, knowing his reputation among the members of the bench and bar in my State, and knowing the reputation which he bears among his neighbors as a man of integrity, a man of honesty, a man trained in the law, I would be doing an injustice to him if I did not vote to confirm his nomination.

It is not my purpose to interfere with the politics of Texas. The citizens of Texas seem to be able to take pretty good care of their politics, and I am willing to let them do so. However, I will say to the Senate that no man from my State who has ever been considered by this body for a judicial office had a better reputation than has Mr. Dooley. As I have said, we all appreciate the value of a good reputation. It is the only thing a man has when the show-down comes. It would be a great injustice to Mr. Dooley for any Senator who knows him to vote against him because of political considerations in the State of Texas.

Amarillo is close to us. Let me give a little geographical background to show how close it is to New Mexico. Amarillo is only 100 miles from the city of Clovis, the home town of my colleague [Mr. HATCH]. Amarillo is 72 miles from the eastern New Mexico line. Amarillo is within 140 miles of the county seat of Quay County, which was named after a great Republican Senator from the State of Pennsylvania. Citizens of New Mexico go to Texas and practice law in Texas. Lawyers from Texas come to New Mexico and practice law there. So we come to know them.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say to the Senate. Irrespective of what happens in Texas, I cannot in good conscience vote against Mr. Dooley.

Mr. President, I give back the remainder of my time to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it seems to me that the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] ought to finish his opening statement at this time, if he is so disposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the two Senators from Texas that the time is theirs, and any agreement which they may reach will be adhered to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator require?

Mr. McGRATH. Five minutes.

Mr. President, it is not a very pleasant matter for Senators to be called upon to take sides on an issue such as that which is now before the Senate of the United States, namely, to make a choice on a matter which is personal to fellow Senators. But, since we are forced to devote our time to questions of this kind, rather than attending to urgent public business, I should like to make my personal position clear in the Record.

Mr. President, I believe it to be the right and duty of the President of the United States to make appointments to judicial offices throughout the country of those men who have been recommended to him as being qualified to fill such positions. I have sat as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and have listened to practically every word of the testimony, which was quite lengthy, regarding the qualifications of Mr. Joe B. Dooley, of Amarillo, Tex., to be a judge in the United States district court for the district in which that city is located. I have not heard, during all the testimony, one single word that would in any way discredit Mr. Dooley from holding the position of United States judge to which the President has nominated him.

Mr. President, I recognize that we as Senators have some personal rights, but I do not believe that the right of any Senator is paramount to the right of an American citizen of good repute who, having consented to allow the use of his name by the President for appointment to a high public office, to be confirmed in that office when we find, after searching inquiry, that he is eminently qualified for the post and nothing is developed

against him either as to his legal ability, attainments, or character. For any one Senator to stand upon the floor and make personal objections, to cast aspersions upon a character such as we have before us, seems to me, Mr. President, to smack a little bit of dictatorship. If this sort of thing can happen in the United States Senate when a man of unimpeachable character and ability can be refused the position to which he has been nominated by the President merely because somebody does not like him personally, then I think we are fast heading down the road which leads to impossibility on the part of any President of the United States to secure men of character, learning, and ability to fill responsible offices of Government.

Mr. Dooley is a past president of the Texas Bar Association. He is a distinguished lawyer, the father of a splendid family, a member of one of the finest law firms in the city in which he lives. He is a lawyer whose name, before it was sent to the Senate, was not even known to the Senator who is making objections to the confirmation of his nomination. Therefore, Mr. President, I can, for my part, in good conscience, vote for Mr. Dooley and feel that I am not doing a disservice to a fellow Senator, because the junior Senator from Texas, in the testimony which he gave before the committee, said he did not know Mr. Dooley before he was nominated; that he had never met him; that Mr. Dooley had never done anything to injure him or to hurt him, and had never said anything about him. How can he be personally obnoxious to that Senator?

Mr. Dooley himself testified before the committee that he had never in his life said anything detrimental to the junior Senator from the State of Texas.

So, Mr. President, basing my conviction upon those broad principles which I have tried to state here today, namely, that any American citizen whose name comes before us for judgment have some rights which we should respect, I shall unhesitatingly cast my vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Joe B. Dooley.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I want to say that I think that some of the procedures which have been resorted to by committees of the Senate in the consideration of Presidential appointments, and some of the things that are going on now in subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member of one, are a disgrace to the American way of doing things. I refer to what is happening to Mr. Philip Perlman, whose name is before the Judiciary Committee today, and what has been happening to him for the past 3 or 4 months at the hands of a subcommittee of the United States Senate, which has seen fit to tear up this man's constitutional rights, to pry into the privacy of his clients, to pry into the privacy of his own affairs, to investigate matters that are none of the committee's business to investigate, and to have delayed the confirmation of that particular nomination during all of these long months.

Like Joe B. Dooley, Mr. Perlman is a distinguished American, a lawyer who

should have been confirmed in his appointment many months ago. Yet, we have had the temerity to sit here and deny to the Supreme Court of the United States during practically a whole term of that court the services of a Solicitor General. I know something about the duties of the Office of Solicitor General, because I had the great distinction of serving in that position for a short period of time. I know that the Supreme Court relies greatly upon the availability of a Solicitor General. The Court has no one else with whom to discuss the various ramifications of procedure in cases in which the United States is a party before that Court, cases which involve the life and the liberties of our people, and millions, yes, billions of dollars. Our Supreme Court has been denied during the last 4 months, while we have delayed around here, the services of a Solicitor General.

So long as I remain a Member of the United States Senate, Mr. President, I shall try to take a broad view of these matters and have my voice heard whenever it can be heard, when things are happening in our committees or on the floor that I think run contrary to the great basic principles of our Government and of our Constitution. I think that if we deny a judgeship to Joe B. Dooley we shall be taking part in a denial of constitutional rights, American rights, to a distinguished lawyer who, through long, long years of private and public life, has won a name for himself in his community, and with whom we should be glad and happy to associate our names in voting for the confirmation of his nomination.

We should also be happy to be given a chance to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Perlman, which has not yet been reported from the committee. I am a member of the subcommittee which is hearing the evidence. There was a meeting scheduled this morning for 10 o'clock. I was there at 10 o'clock, ready to proceed with the hearing, but a Republican Policy Committee meeting was being held, and the rest of the committee could not proceed. Therefore I wasted my time sitting around from 10 o'clock until the Senate convened.

The people of my State sent me here to be on the Senate floor when the Senate is in session, and I intend to stay here. I should like to be doing my whole duty; I should like to be helping to get the Perlman nomination out of committee, but I cannot be there because of the procedure which has been adopted by the committee. The committee does not meet when meetings are called; it meets when it is convenient for the chairman of the committee to hold the meeting, regardless of the time he has advised other Members to be present. I have sat, Mr. President, in those committee hearings on the nomination of Mr. Perlman and have been ashamed of the questions which have been asked. I have been ashamed of the denial of constitutional rights to this man. I have deliberately stayed away from a few of the meetings because I simply could not be a part of what was happening.

Mr. President, I say now that as a member of that committee, fully satisfied with the qualifications of this distinguished lawyer, unless his nomination is soon reported, I, for one, shall move to discharge the committee from the further consideration of Mr. Perlman's nomination so that this American, the same as Joe B. Dooley, can have his fair day in court, the court being the floor of the Senate of the United States to which the President has sent these names and where they are entitled to have their nominations passed upon.

I suspect that the plan is to continue to delay and drag out these hearings until we come to the date of adjournment, so that the country and the United States Supreme Court can go through another year without a Solicitor General. If that is the plan, I wish to give notice here and now that I shall not be a party to it, and that at the proper time I shall move on the floor of the Senate to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the nomination of Philip B. Perlman.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I realize that we are speaking under a limitation of debate. I do not wish to occupy the floor too long. In fact, this morning, as usual, on the floor of the United States Senate, especially during this session, which is the worst I have ever seen in that respect, it is more than discouraging to arise and address the Senate on any subject, for the empty seats around us now are not conducive to argument or to reasoning. Sometimes I wonder of what use it is for a Senator to exert his ability and energy, as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] has just done in his eloquent and able address. It is regrettable, Mr. President, that so often we speak to empty seats.

On this particular occasion, I shall depart for the few moments from the role of United States Senator or the role of an advocate. I wish to appear for a little while, perhaps, in the role of what one would call a witness, a character witness in behalf of the nominee we now consider, the Honorable Joe B. Dooley, of Amarillo, Tex.

It happens that I have lived for a long number of years in the town of Clovis, N. Mex., which is close to the Texas line, and as distances go in our western country, not far from Amarillo, Tex. In that region of my own State, I practiced law for a number of years, and naturally I became acquainted with lawyers throughout that section of the country, including the western district of Texas. I came to know them intimately. With all due respect to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], I think I am in a far better position to testify today before the Senate as to the qualifications of this nominee than is the junior Senator from Texas, for the junior Senator from Texas has said before the committee and, I think, here on the floor of the Senate that he has never

had any personal acquaintance with Mr. Dooley, and never met him until he was nominated for this position.

Mr. President, I have known Mr. Dooley personally and professionally for a number of years. Not only do I have personal knowledge of Mr. Dooley, his character, his integrity, and his ability but I also know his general reputation in that section of the country. I think I speak with some authority when I say that from my own personal knowledge and from the general reputation this man bears throughout that whole region he is qualified to fill this position. He is qualified as a man, a man of honor, a man of integrity; and he is qualified as a lawyer. I challenge any man to bring forth before this body any person who knows Mr. Dooley, or knows his general reputation, who will deny what I have said.

Mr. President, I not only know Mr. Dooley but I know the members of his law firm. I know the standing of that firm, against which reflection has been cast during this debate. The firm of Underwood, Johnson, Dooley & Wilson is one of the outstanding firms of western Texas. I know the individual members of that firm as well as, or some of them better than, I know Mr. Dooley. It happens that Mr. R. C. Johnson and I have been acquainted since before either of us were lawyers. We both attended the same school. The acquaintance we made there has been kept up throughout the years. The last jury case I tried was in association with Mr. Johnson. I do not think anyone will stand here or any place else and say that Mr. Johnson is not a lawyer of integrity and ability; that he does not likewise bear a high reputation in that region of Texas and in my own State, where he is also well known.

Mr. Underwood, the senior member of the firm, has been known throughout west Texas for a long, long period of time. No man bears a higher reputation among the people generally and among the members of the bar and the judges than does Mr. Underwood.

With Mr. Wilson I am not so well acquainted. He is a younger man. But I take it that the fact that Mr. Wilson is a member of this outstanding firm, has been taken in as a partner, is sufficient testimonial as to his ability and as to his character.

Mr. President, my own experience with Mr. Dooley as a lawyer could best be illustrated by the fact that within more or less recent years, as counsel for a trust estate involving considerable property and money, it was necessary to have the services of an attorney in Amarillo, Tex., where much of the property was located. The attorney for the beneficiary of the trust—a Fort Worth attorney, by the way, who lives in this same western district of Texas—was attorney for the Masonic School for Boys Home in Fort Worth, the chief beneficiary under the trust. Before I employed counsel at Amarillo, I conferred with him—because, after all, that school for boys was the one most deeply interested in the proper administration of the estate—to determine what attorney to employ at Amarillo, Tex. After consultation with him, the firm of Underwood, Johnson & Dooley

was employed, and Mr. Dooley personally attended to the legal affairs, which covered considerable time, and still persist. During that period, as well as on other occasions, I had the most intimate personal and professional contact with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. President, all I can say is this: No man can say to me that this nominee is not an honorable man, that he is not an upright citizen, that he is not a good lawyer, that he is not in every way qualified to hold this high and important position. That, Mr. President, founded as I have said upon my own personal knowledge and upon the general reputation of this man, is the reason that I gladly stand here today without hesitation and say a word in behalf of a man whose life and character justify every good thing that can be said about a man.

Mr. President, when we consider that we are dealing with men of this type and character and are confronted with objections to them, we wonder what the proper function of the Senate of the United States is and to what extent any Senator shall be permitted to make an objection based upon the premise that the nominee is personally obnoxious to him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Knowing Mr. Dooley as well as the Senator does, and knowing his reputation as it is known in New Mexico, would not the Senator say that the Senator would be doing a grave injustice to him, practically ruining the life of a man who has built up a reputation throughout the years, if it should reject his nomination?

Mr. HATCH. In answer to my colleague, who has repeatedly said that Mr. Dooley is known in our State, I say again that I think he and I know the nominee better than does either of the Senators from Texas.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I am trying to make is that I actually believe in my heart that the greatest characteristic of the American is fair play, and what would the Senate do to that man, who bears such a fine reputation, if it should turn him down at this moment?

Mr. HATCH. My colleague is absolutely correct in his implication. I can think of nothing more injurious to a man than to be nominated for a position of trust and responsibility, such as a Federal judgeship, and be denied confirmation, to have cast upon him and his family forever the stain of a refusal by the Senate to confirm, when not one single word has been brought against the man's reputation, or his character or ability.

O Mr. President, we have a duty to perform. There is no question of courtesy involved. Talk to me about courtesy when a man's reputation is involved? I desire to be courteous to my fellow Senators, and I will be on every occasion, but God forbid that I shall ever extend courtesy in violation of duty.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Texas began his argument with a dissertation upon the Constitution of the United States and expressed his high admiration for the system of checks and

balances which that great document provides. Yet, to use the rule of personal obnoxiousness is to violate the very principle of checks and balances. I say that because, as we all know, in establishing a system of checks and balances and providing for separation of the powers of the different branches of the Government, as the Constitution does, the founding fathers had in mind one great objective, which was based upon bitter experiences which they themselves had had. That objective was, in providing for a check of one branch of the Government against another, to prevent the vesting of absolute, arbitrary power in any branch of Government or in any official. The founding fathers were fighting against absolute power being vested anywhere, and to prevent that they set up the system of checks and balances.

In connection with the appointment of officials of Government, the Constitution provided that the first power should rest in the President of the United States. "The President of the United States shall nominate," is the language of the Constitution. The choice, the selection in the first instances, rest in the President of the United States, and in him alone. The choice, the selection, does not rest with any Senator, or with all the Senate. Against the abuse of the power vested in the President, the wise founding fathers said that before appointment—not before nomination, but before appointment—the Senate should advise and consent to the appointment. Again avoiding arbitrary, absolute power, all the Senate had was the right to advise against or not consent to an appointment, or to confirm a nomination, as we now say.

Was the idea to vest even in the Senate of the United States an arbitrary power which could be exercised by the whole Senate? To advance that doctrine is to deny the very principles of the Constitution and the principles upon which this Government was founded.

Many quotations could I read from those I hold in my hand from the eminent founding fathers of the Republic, but the best statement of the first theory evolved was that given by a distinguished Senator from Massachusetts regarding the power of the Senate, Senator George Cabot, who served in the Senate from 1791 to 1796. He said:

The power of the Senate was in no sense initiative or even active, but negative and censorial, and was never to be exercised but in cases where the persons proposed for office were unfit.

He continued:

I have always rejected the idea of non-concurrence with a nomination merely because the nominee was less suitable for the office than thousands of others. He must be positively unfit for the office, and the public duty not likely to be performed by him, to justify in my mind the non-concurrence. A departure from this principle would soon wrest from the President altogether the essence of the nominating power, which is the power of selecting officers, and I am fully persuaded that the disposal of offices is of all things the most dangerous to a body of men. The motives to provide for the friends of each other, and to feed their dependents are so powerful, that they will always be yielded to by men who do not stand individually responsible to

public opinion. I am persuaded that any body of men as numerous as the Senate, possessing such a power, however pure they may have been originally, will be corrupted by it, and will corrupt others.

Mr. President, that is the statement of the view which was entertained by men like Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, George Washington, and others most prominent in the early days of the Republic.

From that rule, unfortunately, early in the history of the country Senators soon departed, and various other rules, or so-called rules, grew up, all of which were not adhered to, but were deviated from and changed from time to time, and on particular occasion. But I submit that the true rule could never be better expressed than as it was expressed by Senator Cabot of Massachusetts. At the other extreme, there developed the rule or practice under which any Senator could rise on the floor of the Senate and, without giving his reason therefor, simply declare, "This nominee is personally obnoxious to me;" and, upon such declaration being made, the Senate would withhold confirmation. Mr. President, I say that no such rule, no such authority, not even an implication of such authority, can be found in the Constitution of the United States, neither in the system of checks and balances, nor in the separation of powers. When I said it was absolutely destructive of the thing that the Constitution sought to guard against, the vesting of absolute power in anyone, I mean that this rule does that very thing. It violates the principal objective and purpose of the Constitution, to prevent vesting of absolute and arbitrary power. It gives to one lone Senator the right to stand up in the Senate and, without any reason whatever, to say, "This man shall not be confirmed." By giving any one Senator the power to deny confirmation, it in effect gives him a power to appoint and select; for he may then go to the Executive and say, "Unless the nominee is one that I select or approve, I shall stand up and object on the ground that he is personally obnoxious to me." It gives to an individual Senator an absolute and arbitrary power which was never designed or intended by the Constitution to be bestowed upon him.

There occurs to me a quotation which I want to place in the RECORD. The former Senator from Mississippi the Honorable John Sharp Williams, standing on the floor of the Senate, speaking of the personally obnoxious rule, said:

Before I would rise in a secret session of the Senate—

That was before we had open executive sessions—

to vent my private spleen or to voice my private enmity, or to express my sense of another man's personal enmity to me and defeat his nomination in that way without being able and willing to give some public reason for his defeat, I would resign my seat in that august body.

That, Mr. President, is the honorable rule; it is the rule to which I shall now refer, when I say there grew up over the years a kind of middle-of-the-road rule, by which a Senator could make a per-

sonally obnoxious objection; but in order to make it effective, he must be able to sustain it by reason and by sufficient grounds. In the course of the argument here on the floor, reference has been made to the position of our former distinguished colleague the late Senator from North Carolina, Mr. Bailey, and to the fact that he at one time interposed a personally obnoxious objection. Mr. President, he did interpose such an objection; but great man that he was, great constitutional lawyer that he was, when the former Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Reed, became somewhat confused about the Senator's position and said, in effect or in substance, "If the Senator from North Carolina will stand here and say this nominee is personally obnoxious to him, that will be sufficient for me," the Senator from North Carolina said, "No; I shall give my reasons why he is personally obnoxious to me." He thereupon proceeded to do so. The reasons he gave were reasons which any one of us might have given. The nominee in that connection had libeled, according to Senator Bailey, his State of North Carolina and the judiciary of that State, a charge which made the nominee not only personally obnoxious to Senator Bailey, but also extended into the general question of his fitness for the office. In that one statement Senator Bailey combined what he believed to be the correct rule, and he did not depart from it later.

Again, when Senator Bailey was speaking here on the nomination, as I recollect, of a collector for internal revenue for the State of West Virginia, he expanded his view of what he said was the unwritten law of the Senate on this subject, as follows:

It is a rule that rises above courtesies we owe to every Senator. \* \* \* When it is invoked by a Senator, the whole question in my mind is, "Is his action arbitrary?"

In other words, according to Senator Bailey, it is not sufficient for a man to rise in the Senate and in an arbitrary manner say, "He is personally obnoxious to me."

Is it political?

Political considerations, said Senator Bailey, should never move a man in such cases. That was the effect of his statement.

If so, I would have a right to reject it. But, if it is well founded—

If the objection that a man is personally obnoxious is well founded—

then my respect for the Senate rule, a sense of my own self-protection under similar conditions, commands me to sustain the rule.

He sustains the rule upon two grounds: First, that the nominee was in fact personally obnoxious; and, second, that sound and sufficient reasons were given for the objection.

Mr. President, if a rule outside the Constitution is to be adopted, if Senators are to go beyond the confines of that document, if a rule is to be adopted that recognizes the right of a Senator to make the personal objection, then the rule should require, as contended by Senator Bailey, that the Senator objecting must go further and give good foundation for his objection. That is exactly what Senator Bailey did. I do not subscribe to

that rule. For myself, I subscribe to the original doctrine that our duties are confined to determining a man's fitness and qualifications for office. But I realize that Senators differ on that point. It is a matter about which Senators themselves must make up their own minds; each Senator must determine for himself. I question no man's motive and no man's right to arrive at such a conclusion as the one at which Senator Bailey arrived. Certainly no man can say that a Senator should be permitted to stand here and arbitrarily defeat the will of the nominating power, without raising any question of qualification or fitness for office, by saying, "I say 'No'; and because I say 'No,' 95 Members of this body must bow down to that single objection."

Mr. President, I yield to no man in devotion to the Constitution. I want to see the separation of powers maintained, and I am strong in my desire to see the original intent and purpose of that document carried out, that absolute power shall not rest anywhere, not in any branch of government, and certainly not in one individual Senator.

The junior Senator from Texas, in a way, dramatizes his obligation to comply with the rule laid down by Senator Bailey, and he sets forth his reasons as to why this man—a man with whom he is not acquainted, a man with whom he never had contact—is personally obnoxious to him. What does he say in that regard, Mr. President? I shall not attempt to review everything that was said in the long hours of debate. I think it was rather sharply set forth in the letter which the Senator wrote to all of us giving his reasons for his objections, in connection with which he charged that the nomination of Joe B. Dooley represented some sort of a dark and devious plot, a conspiracy of the New Deal dynasty to humiliate the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, if there had been a deep and dark and devious plot conceived by the New Deal dynasty—I am not sure what that is—if anybody had conceived a plot to bring any Member of this body into humiliation and disgrace, I will say that would be sufficient reason for objecting to the nominee had he been a party to any such plot. I think the objection would go to the nominee's qualification and fitness, and not because he was personally obnoxious, and I would back up a Senator who could sustain such a position as that.

But who formed this dark and devious plot? Is there anything in the record to show it? I have not seen anything or heard anything to show it. Even if those who object, if there be any others than the junior Senator from Texas, know of any such plot, it has not been revealed. Who were the conspirators? What are their names? All through the argument I noticed that the junior Senator from Texas said, "They did so and so; they did so and so." No names were called. The details of the plot were not given. I ask, how in the world could the nomination of a man of character and ability and high qualifications for office humiliate any Senator? How could such

a plot or conspiracy be formed to name a man who is qualified for public position to a high honorable office? And how could that humiliate the junior Senator from Texas?

Ah, Mr. President, the naming of such a man as that to high office, and his confirmation by the Senate, will not humiliate the junior Senator from Texas, but if a man of character and ability, a man against whose whole life there has not been brought one single word, is denied confirmation by this body, I do not hesitate to say that the entire Senate of the United States will be humiliated and disgraced by such procedure.

O Mr. President, if there is anything against this man, bring it forth. If there is anyone who can say there has been any conspiracy of any kind, let him stand forth and say it.

Mr. President, I sought to appear before the Committee on the Judiciary to tell the committee what I knew about Joe B. Dooley. True, I was late. The regular hearings had been closed. But I thought, after all, there is such a thing as courtesy among Senators, and perhaps the members of the committee would listen to me give them my own personal knowledge. Perhaps I took too much credit to myself in thinking that that great committee, of which I was at one time a member, might like to hear me in person say what I knew about Mr. Dooley. I was denied that privilege, Mr. President.

Mr. MOORE rose.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator permit me to finish? The junior Senator from Texas appeared before the committee and testified. Still I was denied the privilege of giving my personal testimony. The reason I was denied that privilege was no reflection on me, and I took it as no discourtesy, because I was told that there was no evidence against the character of Mr. Dooley, and therefore it was unnecessary for me to appear.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from New Mexico completed his statement before he yielded to me. The Senator knows that the Committee on the Judiciary will never at any time deny to any Senator the privilege of appearing before it, and especially would the Senator from New Mexico not be denied by the committee the privilege of telling what he thought the committee should know. I am glad the Senator concluded his statement and said it was unnecessary for him to appear, for the reasons stated. I will say to the Senator that I would never deny the Senator the privilege of appearing before the committee.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Oklahoma was present that morning, and I think he will agree that I have correctly stated the situation. I did not object to what was done. In fact, when the committee told me there was no evidence against the character of Mr. Dooley, there was no necessity in my appearing, because what I wanted to tell them was what a good man Joe B. Dooley was, and how I knew him to be such.

Mr. President, I do not want to take more of the time of the senior Senator from Texas. I think I have made it clear that I have considered it a responsibility, an obligation, and a duty for me to say to the Senate what I have said in behalf of Mr. Dooley, and I have been proud and glad to do it, because the man's entire life, personal and professional, justifies it—nay, demands it.

Mr. President, because I feel so strongly on this subject, I want to say to the junior Senator from Texas that I am not standing against him personally. I am against his position in this case as vigorously and as strongly as I know how to be. I am not even standing with the senior Senator from Texas on this proposition. Whatever differences may have existed or do exist respecting patronage questions and such things are matters with which I have no concern or interest whatever. But I am glad to stand here today by the side of the nominee. I am glad to stand on the floor of the Senate and try to deal fairly with a man who has dealt fairly with his fellow men all his life. I am glad to have said what I have said honestly about a man who has been honest in all his dealings with his fellow men.

Mr. President, I am glad as a lawyer to stand here and pay tribute to the man's high reputation as a lawyer. I would take the letter written by Judge Wilson, supposed by the junior Senator from Texas to be Mr. Dooley's campaign manager, and which the Senator sent around to all of us—an honorable judge who has occupied the position of judge of the northern district of Texas for many years—and let that letter also stand as a testimonial to the fairness, honesty, integrity, character, ability, and the fitness of the nominee for office.

I should like to talk about the railroad lobby, and the attorney, Mr. H. C. Pipkin, of Amarillo, Tex., whom I also have known for many years. I challenge the junior Senator from Texas—I am sorry he has gone from the Chamber—to say one word against the character and honor of Mr. Pipkin. I will say that the enemies of the junior Senator from Texas probably will say that the worst blot upon the reputation of Mr. Pipkin is that he has always been an ardent supporter, political and otherwise, of the junior Senator from Texas. Mr. Pipkin came here and testified in behalf of the nominee.

Mr. President, I would say one more word. I would simply urge Senators to accord the nominee the degree of fairness and justice and square and honest dealing that they would expect to receive from the hands of the Senate of the United States if they were nominated to a high and responsible office. If Senators will follow that rule, this nomination will be confirmed, as it should be confirmed, without a single, solitary dissenting vote.

Mr. President, I have made reference to various statements relating to the constitutional duties of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that they all may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SENATOR BAILEY'S VIEWS

The committee's report, adverse to the nomination, was presented by Bailey, who expounded his own view of the unwritten law of the Senate known as the personal obnoxiousness rule.

"It is a rule that rises above the courtesies we owe to every Senator. . . . When it is invoked by a Senator, the whole question in my mind is, is his action arbitrary, is it political? If so, I would have a right to reject it. But if it is well founded, then my respect for the Senate rule, a sense of my own self-protection under similar conditions, commands me to sustain the rule. . . . I rather think that the rule should not go. It has been a rule of the Senate a long time."

#### MADISON'S VIEWS

Two days later the Senate passed a resolution declaring that "in the opinion of the Senate, the powers and duties of the Secretary of the Department of the Treasury, and those of an Envoy Extraordinary to a foreign power, are so incompatible, that they ought not to be, and remain united in the same person"; and the Senate instructed the committee on Gallatin's nomination to communicate this resolution to the President of the United States, and respectfully to confer with him upon the matter thereof.

Thereupon President Madison sent a message to the Senate in which he set forth his views as follows:

"The Executive and the Senate in the cases of appointments to office, and of treaties, are to be considered as independent of and coordinate with each other. If they agree, the appointments or treaties are made. If the Senate disagree, they fail. If the Senate wish information previous to their final decision, the practices . . . has been either to request the Executive to furnish it, or to refer the subject to a committee of their body, to communicate either formally or informally, with the head of the proper department. The appointment of a committee of the Senate to confer immediately with the Executive himself appears to lose sight of the co-ordinate relation between the Executive and the Senate, which the Constitution has established, and which ought therefore to be maintained."

#### WASHINGTON'S ATTITUDE ON APPOINTMENTS—NEITHER PERSONAL NOR POLITICAL

From the outset President Washington anticipated that the exercise of the appointing power would prove one of the most difficult parts of the duty of his office. A few months later he declared this to be "the most irksome part of the Executive trust." No President ever approached the task with greater singleness of purpose. The advances of relatives seeking office met with chilling discouragement. He declared that nothing beyond testimonials with respect to abilities, integrity, and fitness would be of any avail in his decisions. An intimate personal friend applied to him for a lucrative office. No one doubted that he would receive it. A political enemy applied for the same position, and, although everyone marveled at his presumption, he got the nomination. To a friend who remonstrated with the President at this choice Washington replied:

"My friend I receive with cordial welcome; he is welcome to my house and welcome to my heart, but, with all his good qualities, he is not a man of business. His opponent is, with all his politics so hostile to me, a man of business; my private feelings have nothing to do in this case. I am not George Washington, but President of the United

States. As George Washington, I would do this man any kindness in my power; as President of the United States, I can do nothing."

#### WASHINGTON'S VIEWS

To the question what scope should be given to the Senate's advice and consent, President Washington gave not a little anxious thought. He sought advice, and weighed it carefully. In his diary he recorded (April 28, 1790):

"Had some conversation with Mr. Madison on the propriety of consulting the Senate on the places to which it would be necessary to send persons on the diplomatic line and consuls; and with respect to the grade of the first—His opinion coincides with Mr. Jay's and Mr. Jefferson's—to wit—that they have no Constitutional right to interfere with either, and that it might be impolitic to draw it into a precedent, their powers extending no farther than to an approbation or disapprobation of the person nominated by the President, all the rest being executive and vested in the President by the Constitution."

#### SENATOR BORAH'S VIEWS

Despite Holt's protest, and this defense of the rule by Bailey in presenting the Finance Committee's adverse recommendation, the nomination of Yoke was confirmed by a vote of 46 to 15.

The next day Senator Borah submitted a significant resolution. Declaring that it had been the practice (not the rule) of the Senate to refuse to confirm a nomination stated to be personally objectionable by a Senator from the State affected, and that the matter of confirmation should be determined by the qualifications and fitness of the nominee, and not by the personal feelings, likes, or dislikes of a Senator, it proceeded:

"Whereas such a practice transfers the power of rejection or confirmation from the Senate as a whole to a single Senator, in violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate discontinues and disapproves of such practice and will hereafter not respect or give effect to objections based upon the fact that said nominee may be declared personally offensive or personally objectionable to a Senator."

#### ALEXANDER HAMILTON

It will be the office of the President to nominate, and with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint. There will, of course, be no exertion of choice on the part of the Senators. They may defeat one choice of the Executive, and oblige him to make another; but they cannot themselves choose—they can only ratify or reject the choice of the President.

#### PRESIDENT TAFT

In the matters of recommendation, and, indeed, of obtaining office, it is leg-muscle and lack of modesty which win, rather than fitness and character. The appointing power is in effect in the Senators' hands, subject only to a veto by the President.

#### JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, ON PERSONAL OBNOXIOUS RULE

Before I would rise in a secret session of the Senate of the United States, to vent my private spleen or to voice my private enmity, or to express my sense of another man's personal enmity to me and defeat his nomination in that way without being able and willing to give some public reason for his defeat, I would resign my seat in that august body.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President—The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is at the disposal of the two Sena-

tors from Texas. The Chair can recognize other Senators only if time is granted to them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief request. Will the Senator yield for a minute?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not the floor. The junior Senator from Texas is not in the Chamber. It is his time to proceed. Does the Senator wish to speak about the case before us?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair requests the presence of the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not disposed to deny the Senator from West Virginia an opportunity to submit his request, but I do not wish to take up too much of my time. The junior Senator from Texas has had 2 days. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Less than a minute.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the Senator from West Virginia proceeds, the Chair suggests that the officers of the Senate try to obtain the presence of the junior Senator from Texas?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be permitted to meet while the Senate is in session today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

The Chair is at the mercy of Senators in charge of the time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want to accommodate the Chair and other members of the Senate. The junior Senator from Texas occupied nearly 2 days—one entire day and nearly all of another day. Until today we have had no opportunity to address the Senate. In all fairness, I think he should proceed and finish his opening statement so that we may make reply to it. I do not know where he is.

I shall yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very deeply regret the absence of so many Senators at this session of the Senate. This case has been pending before either the committee or the Senate since early in January. It was thoroughly investigated and examined by the Committee on the Judiciary. A number of hearings were held. After the hearings were concluded the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] received a letter from someone in Texas, and the committee reconvened and examined what was supposed to be in the letter. We are now nearing a vote on the nomination, and I very greatly regret that Senators are not present in greater number to hear the few remarks I shall make.

Mr. President, in the brief time allotted to me I wish to point out some of the vital things involved in this case. When Senators are elected to serve in this body, they are elected to serve the purposes of the Constitution of the United States. That includes legislative matters, of course. It also includes that part of the

Constitution relating to nominations made by the President of the United States. It is just as much our duty to give attention and consideration to nominations, and to abide by the rules of the Senate respecting nominations, as it is to respect the Constitution when it comes to legislation.

When it comes to a nomination, I feel that I am under constitutional compulsion, if I find the nominee to be a man of good character and a man of qualifications, with no charges against him, to vote to confirm his nomination.

Let us see about this case. The junior Senator from Texas has made a great commotion about a plot which was inspired to humiliate and discredit him. I know that there is no basis whatever for such a charge as that. The President of the United States does not even know Mr. Dooley. Mr. Dooley has never met the President of the United States. If there is a diabolical and sinister plot, as the junior Senator from Texas charges, the senior Senator from Texas is the diabolical plotter who ought to be held responsible.

Mr. President, this is simply a routine nomination, in the regular course of senatorial business. When Judge Wilson, the incumbent, notified the President and the public that he was about to retire, immediately lawyers all over this judicial district began to write me and to urge that I recommend for appointment Joe B. Dooley. I have never discussed this case with the President of the United States. The President of the United States has never consulted me, except through the Attorney General to advise me that there was to be a vacancy, and that he would be glad to have any recommendations I might see fit to make.

Mr. President, this is not even a political appointment. Mr. Dooley has been only casually known to me over the years. He is not one of my political lieutenants. He is not a part of my machine. I do not have such things. He is simply an outstanding lawyer and citizen. Outside Fort Worth, where the junior Senator resides, and where the two candidates whom he recommended reside, and outside that county, members of the bar of that district are almost unanimous in support of Mr. Dooley. I would not say that they are unanimous, of course, because I have not consulted all of them. However, lawyers from 48 counties in that district recommended Joe B. Dooley before any nomination was made by the President or any recommendation was made by me. As I recall, there was no protest from the bar. There were some endorsements, of course, from Fort Worth, of the two men whom the junior Senator had recommended for appointment, but there was no protest against the name of Joe B. Dooley.

When the committee met, not a single member of the bar of that district, with one exception, came before the committee to oppose the nomination of Mr. Dooley; and that one testified that Mr. Dooley was a man of high character. He testified that he was a man of great ability as a lawyer. His only objection was that he thought both Senators ought to agree. The witness to whom I refer was

Mr. Karl Crowley, a lawyer, who was for several years in Washington under the Roosevelt administration as Solicitor for the Post Office Department. Even he testified to the character and ability of Mr. Dooley, and made no complaint in any respect.

Mr. President, who is Mr. Dooley? Mr. Dooley is not a politician. He has never held public office, except for one term on the school board, I believe. He has never been a candidate for office. He has been a lawyer. He has been a lawyer's lawyer, a man devoted to the bar, a man who has attained eminence and distinction as a member of the bar. He served as president of the State bar association. Complaint was made by the junior Senator from Texas that Mr. Dooley was nominated to that place in order to help him get this position. That is simply fantastic. He served, first, as a director of the bar association in his area. He was then elected vice president of the bar association of the entire State, and was elected president of the State bar association before the question of his nomination for judge ever came up or was ever considered.

Mr. President, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if the Senators will consult it, shows that Mr. Dooley is endorsed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Texas. It shows that his candidacy is endorsed by a number of other judges of the Supreme Court of Texas before whom he practiced. It shows that he is endorsed by judges of the court of civil appeals and other judges not confined to his immediate territory.

If Senators will read the RECORD they will find that he was endorsed by 15 former presidents of the State Bar Association of Texas. He was endorsed recently in Dallas by his old law class; he was endorsed unanimously by all of those who were present at the convention of the State Bar Association, where they testified to his ability, his capacity, his character, and all the qualities which go to make an eminent and useful judge of the district court.

Mr. President, what are the objections to Mr. Dooley? When I received the recommendations from the bar of that district there accompanied them an appeal that the western part of the district should at last be recognized by the appointment of a judge.

I have a map here for the convenience of the Senate. It shows that for nearly 70 years Fort Worth has had the district judgeship. In the meantime, the tremendous area to the west of Fort Worth has grown and developed and is now being settled and populated. Amarillo is some 300 or 400 miles from Fort Worth. Dallas has two district judges. Fort Worth is only 33 or 34 miles from Dallas and has access to the judges who are in Dallas as well as those who are in Fort Worth. Within the district west of Fort Worth there are five divisions of the court, and there is only one division in Fort Worth.

I thought it was just and fair that the western part of that district be recognized by the appointment of a judge. There is more business in the district outside of Fort Worth, in those five divisions,

than there is in Fort Worth. Yet the junior Senator from Texas contends that because Fort Worth has had the district judge for nearly 70 years it should continue to have him. I did not think so. On the basis of the recommendations by the bar and by the citizenship of that district, and because of considerations of geography, I recommended to the President the appointment of Mr. Dooley.

There is the heart of the plot. There is the heart of this diabolical and sinister enterprise to discredit and humiliate the junior Senator from Texas.

Frankly, the junior Senator from Texas and his political fortunes did not occur to me in making the endorsement. I was not disregarding them, and I was not regarding them. I knew he also had the right to make endorsements, as I had the right to make them. He speaks of not having been consulted. The record shows that he was consulted. The record shows that the Attorney General called him and asked him if he wanted to make an endorsement, and he responded with two endorsements of men from Fort Worth, both of them splendid gentlemen, both of them able lawyers. If the President of the United States had nominated either one of them I would vote for the confirmation of the nomination. There is no politics involved in this matter from my viewpoint; there is no spleen; there is no feeling. Some Senators have approached me and said, "Now, CONNALLY, this is simply a fight between you and the junior Senator from Texas over patronage." The junior Senator from Texas disavows that, and I likewise want to disavow it.

My colleague has as much right to make recommendations as I have. I have never taken any part in the campaigns of the junior Senator from Texas, and I have never done anything in the Senate to discredit him. What I have done was done to aid him, I thought. I have been courteous. I have tried to aid him in regard to committee assignments and matters of that kind, and I have never participated in any movement to discredit him. It is simply a case where both Senators have the right to make endorsements. The junior Senator did not seem to be able to make up his mind, because he endorsed two candidates, both from his own town, both splendid gentlemen and fine lawyers, and if either one had been nominated I would vote for confirmation.

Mr. President, I yield myself five more minutes.

What is the situation? Senators have come to me and said, "Your man is all right; his character is good, but he is personally obnoxious to your colleague." There are precedents in these matters. In the old days all a Senator had to do was to rise in his place and, on his integrity and honor as a Senator—remember that—state that the nominee was not generally obnoxious, not politically obnoxious, but personally obnoxious to him. In the old days that rule obtained. But, Mr. President, when a Senator stood on the floor and, on his honor and integrity, made that declaration it was implied that the nominee had done something or said something which gave

ground for his being personally obnoxious—obnoxious to the Senator personally, not to the entire Senate. He had said something or done something or committed some offense which gave the Senator the right to say, "He is personally obnoxious to me."

But, over the years, that rule has been changed. The late Senator Borah, of Idaho, one of the greatest men to serve in the Senate for many years, voted against that rule. He said it was outmoded; that the only test in the Senate was character, capacity, and ability. I have seen it set aside in this Chamber since I have been a Member of the Senate. The rule, if there is a rule—there is no rule; it has merely grown up here by courtesy—the practice now is that when a Senator makes the claim that a nominee is personally obnoxious to him he must state the reasons and the grounds for his statement. I remember that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] asked the junior Senator from Texas if he would state what this man had done or said that made him personally obnoxious. The junior Senator from Texas made no reply except to say that under the precedents it is only necessary to say that a nominee is personally obnoxious.

Mr. President, do you not think that in fairness, in candor, and in justice to the Senate, the junior Senator from Texas should tell the Senate what offense the nominee has committed against him, what words he uttered which were disrespectful to the Senator from Texas, or what acts he may have committed which were in derogation of the Senator from Texas?

What is the proof as to that, Mr. President? The committee had that question under consideration; and the testimony before the committee is to the effect that Mr. Dooley had never met the junior Senator from Texas in his life until he met him in the committee room. The further testimony was that the junior Senator from Texas had never known Mr. Dooley, had never seen him, except he qualified it by saying that he thought perhaps he had seen him once in a crowd. On the other hand, Mr. Dooley says he never met the junior Senator from Texas. The proof shows that they had never had any communication of any kind. The proof further shows that Mr. Dooley has never handled any law business or other matters in which the junior Senator from Texas was involved.

Mr. President, with that kind of a record, no matter what a Senator says, how can there be anything on which to base personal obnoxiousness? How can there be any foundation for such a charge? Is the Senate going to adopt a doctrine that it will reject the nomination of a man who is qualified, who has character, who has been appointed by the President, and who has been approved by our own Judiciary Committee, simply because some Senator says he is personally obnoxious to him, although the record and the sworn testimony show that there is no ground whatever for an objection based upon personal obnoxiousness? How can a man be obnoxious to me unless he does something to me, un-

less he says something about me, unless he offends me in some way? Have I a radar mind which enables me, after looking up into the sky, to say, "This man is personally obnoxious to me, and he cannot be appointed"? Oh, no, Mr. President; when the facts are one way and the statements are another way, how can the Senate adopt the cruel, unreasonable, and ridiculous policy that it will reject the nomination of a man simply because a Senator says he is personally obnoxious, although the facts show that it would be absolutely physically impossible for him to be personally obnoxious?

If there is any obnoxiousness in this record at all, it is supposed to be political. This man Dooley is not a politician. He never held office except as school trustee. The junior Senator from Texas has said that Mr. Dooley was a New Dealer, and that any New Dealer is personally obnoxious to him. That was the final reason he gave. I have the record here, and I shall look it up in a moment. The junior Senator from Texas said that Mr. Dooley was personally obnoxious to him because all New Dealers are personally obnoxious to him.

Mr. President, as I have said, Mr. Dooley is not a politician. He rarely, if ever, has done anything more than go to the ballot box and vote. Yes, he is a Democrat. He is what might be called a good, middle-of-the-road Democrat, just as there are a number of good, middle-of-the-road Republicans in this Chamber. That political charge can have no basis here. The fact of the matter is, I feel sure, that Mr. Dooley is not what many persons would call an extreme radical as a New Dealer.

Mr. Dooley is a man of conservative habits and conservative mind. He is trained at the law; and all of us know that training at the law has a tendency to instill conservatism in the bosom of a man. He respects the precedents, he respects the facts, he is conscious of them, and he is indifferent to radical change. We all know that. That is the kind of New Dealer Judge Dooley was.

Mr. President, there is no foundation whatever for the objection. But we see that if there is any objection at all, it is not personal obnoxiousness, but is political obnoxiousness.

Now let me say a word along that line. I have been a Member of the Senate for 18 years. During that time I have never voted against a Republican nominee because he was a Republican. I do not now recall that I ever voted against one, except one nominee for membership in the Supreme Court, some years ago; and my objection to him was not personal, but was because I did not agree with what I thought were some of his views. Later on he became a member of the Court, and he made a great judge; and on one occasion I expressed to him my regret that I had misunderstood his attitude, and had voted against him.

But I have never voted against a single nominee of a Republican President because he was a Republican. Since I have been in the Senate, three Federal judges were appointed in Texas by Mr. Hoover. I voted to confirm the nominations of

every one of them. Because a man is a Republican is no reason, to my mind, why his nomination should not be confirmed, if he has the requisite qualifications and character.

I can name those judges, if that is desired. One of them is Judge Kennerly, of Houston, a man of fine character and fine attainments. He was appointed district judge, and I cheerfully voted for him.

Another one was Judge Bryant, of Sherman, Tex., a Republican. His father had been a judge, years ago. He is a fine man. I endorsed him and supported him. Of course, he is a Republican, but what difference should that make? The Constitution does not say that we have to vote against a man because he is a Democrat; it does not say that we have to vote against a man because he is a Republican. A nominee is considered here as an appointee, with his qualifications and his character. Those are the tests. There are no other tests, under the Constitution, save a Senator's own conscience and his own convictions as to whether the nominee is the proper man.

The other judge was Judge McMillan, of San Antonio, Tex., a Republican. I voted for him; I supported him. As I recall, in my 18 years of Senate life I have never objected to any nominee because he was a Republican. Yet the junior Senator from Texas bases his opposition to Mr. Dooley on political grounds, saying that he is a New Dealer. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Texas is no more correct about that than he is about the so-called senatorial plot. If there is any plot, I am the plotter; if there is anything diabolical, I am the one who is diabolical; if there is anything sinister, I am the one who is sinister—simply because I made this recommendation. I never discussed it with the President in my life. I made the recommendation and sent to the Attorney General the letters which had been written to me by members of the bar. The Attorney General, I suppose, acquainted the President with the situation, and the President nominated Mr. Dooley. That is the plot, that is this dire conspiracy, concocted behind closed doors, in the dark, with all the machinations of political scheming and diabolical and sinister planning. I never talked to the President about it in my life. I talked to the Attorney General, and a good many thought he wanted another man, not the one recommended by the junior Senator or the one recommended by me, but another man, a resident of Fort Worth, but he could not overcome the present nominee.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to the map on the wall of the Senate. It is a map of the western district of Texas. I point out Fort Worth to Senators. Here is Dallas, in the next county. Dallas has now two district judges. Fort Worth has one, who has been on the bench 28 years. Senators will note all this territory to the west from Fort Worth, including the territory on the Red River, reaching all the way to Kansas on the north, New Mexico and Colorado on the

west, running south, away down, a tremendous area, to include San Angelo and Abilene.

Mr. President, in that territory there are five court divisions; one at Wichita Falls, one at Amarillo, one at Lubbock, one at Abilene, and one at San Angelo. That section has had a marvelous development, in industry, in the raising of cattle, in the production of wheat, oil, and all the modern products of Texas.

I do not know just the distance from Amarillo to Fort Worth, but it is three or four hundred miles. I thought it was fair to put a judge somewhere out in that territory, one who could serve these five divisions, and to whom the lawyers would have access for their extraordinary writs and processes.

Fort Worth, which I indicate here on the map, is only 35 miles from Dallas. Dallas has two Federal judges, and Fort Worth has one. There will be another appointment some of these days, and if the junior Senator from Texas will be patient he may get a judge out of his home town. But he bases his opposition on the fact that a plot exists to appoint a judge from a place other than his home town, Fort Worth, where there has been a judgeship for 70 years.

Mr. President, I understand I have used 30 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used 31 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not consume more of the time of the Senate. Later I shall have something more to say, and I crave the consideration and attention of Senators when I resume the floor.

I want Senators to remember that there is no basis on earth for the "personally obnoxious" objection. The committee members will state that it was demonstrated that Mr. Dooley did not know the junior Senator from Texas, and that the junior Senator from Texas did not know Mr. Dooley. The testimony of Mr. Dooley is that he never said a word against the junior Senator from Texas, and has never done anything to him, he has never taken part in any of the campaigns in which the junior Senator has become involved. How can there be any ground for the charge of personal obnoxiousness, in the face of these hard, inexorable, and unbending facts?

I submit to the judgment of Senators, not to their prejudice. I do not want to talk to Senators who are being actuated, if any are, by prejudice. This is the Senate of the United States. This is not a corner grocery store, where people indulge in gossip, in slander, in back-door talk. This is the Senate of the United States, and its Members should be governed by high and honorable motives. They should not send Mr. Dooley away from the doors of the Senate with a stain upon him, a stain that could not be washed away by words, a stain that could not be eradicated by any sort of cleaning fluid. If the Senate does not confirm him, it sends him away with the condemnation of the Senate of the United States, when he has done nothing to deserve it, when the committee could not find a blemish on his character, when the committee could not find a single thing against his reputation as a lawyer, when the committee could not find evidence of

anything he had ever done or ever said or ever uttered or ever committed against the junior Senator from Texas.

How could the objection be personal? It has to be personal; it cannot be political. It has to be personal, involving something Mr. Dooley has done to the person of the junior Senator from Texas. Such a thing does not exist, it never did exist, it cannot exist, in the face of facts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Texas has approximately 25 minutes remaining. The junior Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, as I have stated on the Senate floor previously, I have great admiration for men of legal talent and experience and ability. I humble myself before them when with their oratory and eloquence they seek to defend a cause. I appreciate what has been said here today by the two Senators from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH and Mr. CHAVEZ] and my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I appreciate the discussion of the Constitution by the able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is an authority on it. I appreciate all these things. I appreciate the fact that the senior Senator from Texas has confirmed that this is not a patronage fight between the two Texas Senators.

I also appreciate beyond words the assurance from my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas, that if I will just be patient I may some day have something to say about the selection of Federal judges in Texas. I have been patient for almost 6 years. I do not know just exactly when patience ceases to be a virtue. I have tried to practice the virtue of patience.

At the present time I am opposing the nomination of Joe B. Dooley, of Amarillo, for various reasons. I do not put all my eggs in one basket. I object because the nomination is personally obnoxious. A nomination is not a person in being, an animate creature; the nomination before us is the whole process by which this nominee's name has been submitted to the Senate, and the whole thing is a sinister, diabolical plot, I repeat. I am glad the senior Senator from Texas has disclaimed any part in this sinister, diabolical plot, and I have never accused him of being a party to it. Nevertheless, the plot does exist, it is a living, breathing thing, and it has existed over a period of years. This is simply a continuation of it.

Mr. President, I did not know before that it was absolutely essential to be personally acquainted with a man in order for that man to be personally obnoxious. I am using a very broad comparison, but I have always considered Mr. Hitler as being personally obnoxious to me. I never met the man and do not know whether he is living or dead, but he and a few others in this world whom I have never met are personally obnoxious.

Mr. President, there are other objections to this nomination. I have stated them upon the floor of the Senate and other places. I will try to touch on these objections in this discourse. One of the principal objections is that the sinister

diabolical plot is a scheme to use the Senate of the United States as a political weapon for the purpose of purging a United States Senator. It does not particularly worry me, so far as personal consequences are concerned, not any more than it may worry any other Senator, should this precedent be established or should this system be allowed to continue; but that is a point to which I object. I think it is wrong to use the Senate for such a purpose.

I may not be in position to speak so eloquently about the Constitution of the United States as my able friend, the senior Senator from New Mexico. As I said before he entered the Chamber, I always enjoy listening to him. But, in my humble station in life, I have a great admiration for the Constitution of the United States. In my humble way, I have carefully studied it and I have read much about it. I think it is the greatest document outside the Holy Bible that was ever written by the hand of civilized and Christianized man. I think it laid down a principle of government which has endured for over 165 years. It has enabled its citizens under this Constitution to develop from a wilderness the greatest nation on the face of the earth. When our wise forefathers went about the task of setting up our American form of representative democracy, they had uppermost in their minds the firm conviction that it should be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. That was not just an empty catch phrase. Those words, "of the people, by the people, and for the people," were not coined for the exclusive use of Fourth of July orators. These men had in their subconscious minds the great panorama of all past history, during which, except in isolated cases of short duration, the masses of the people had been slaves or subjects of those who were generally claimed to be supermen, and men of superminds. But history proves that all men are of the flesh—that all men, being human, will sooner or later make mistakes, regardless of their honesty and regardless of their good intentions. Based on this undeniable fact that the few men who did the thinking for the masses made a serious mistake, as a result of which their nation was thrown into confusion and was generally taken over by some other tribe or government, either by force of arms or by infiltration, our wise forefathers reasoned that the thinking by the masses would be a better protection for the people as a whole, because it is rarely possible for the majority of the people, through the sum total of their thinking, to be completely wrong. That is possible for some superminded individual, rarely. So, for this and for many other reasons, they set up this Government of, by, and for the people. This system has stood the test of time. By this process, as I stated before, our Nation has grown and prospered. It has grown from a wilderness to become the greatest nation on the face of God's earth.

Today, Mr. President, in the Senate of the United States, we are dealing with one of the most vital and fundamental component parts of this great system.

We are dealing with the selection of a person to fill an office for the remainder of his lifetime, unless he retire or be retired for misbehavior. That is a very important position. That position may affect the lives of all citizens in a judicial district of any one of our sovereign States—the office of district judge. The person who is finally sworn in to fill this position will have the power to determine the disposition of the material possessions of the people, the marital relations of families, the important question as to whether or not some of the citizens may live or may be put to death. That means much to the people of my State. It means a great deal to them that we get a man of judicial experience, a man trained in criminal law, a man having all the qualifications that a judge should have, to rule over them in judicial matters. Those are great responsibilities to place in the hands of one man. That is why our wise forefathers determined that the selection of that man should depend not alone upon the judgment of one man, our Chief Executive, who is elected every 4 years by the people of the sovereign States, through an intricate system of balloting; but also it should depend upon approval by the majority of the Senators, who are chosen for a period of 6 years, through an entirely different balloting system, by the people of the sovereign States. Our wise forefathers set up a very important system of selecting the Federal judge, because they realized he might pronounce the death sentence on any of our citizens.

It appears to me that our wise forefathers went a long way for the protection of the individual citizens of this great Nation when they set up the system of selecting Federal judges. But, Mr. President, they did not stop with that. They went further. I think perhaps the framers of our Constitution actually envisioned, at some distant day, there might spring up in our Nation certain cliques which would become known as political parties, and who, for the sake of manifesting power to govern the people, might place the welfare of the party above the welfare of the Nation. They naturally concluded that if such a disastrous thing as that should spring up or develop, some of the Senators might deem it personally expedient to go along with the party, and that if a sufficient number of those Senators, whom they looked upon as ambassadors of the sovereign States, representing their States in the newly established Federal Government—if enough of them should become loyal members of a political party seeking to rule the Nation, the people of such States might find themselves without due representation in the Upper Chamber of the Federal Government. So, as a partial protection against such a disastrous potential circumstance, our wise forefathers did a thing that had never been done before in any government, and that has never been done since. They provided for two United States Senators, instead of merely one. One person serves as President, as governor, as Representative from a congressional district, as president of a corporation, as mayor of a city, and so, all down the line, one man fills an individual

office. But our wise forefathers placed two men in the same office with identical duties and responsibilities. It is the only public office on record in which two people are empowered to perform identical duties and to discharge identical responsibilities, both being selected by the same system. The only reason that could be assigned for such a phenomenon is a desire to safeguard the right of the people to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, in case one of the Senators fails or refuses to respect the wishes of the people of his State on the selection of a Federal judge, regardless of how small that minority may be.

Mr. President, I thank God for the wisdom of our forefathers in looking down the corridor of time to envision with accuracy the situation which exists in this Chamber at this moment. While it is a distasteful duty, I am nevertheless performing it with all my might and vigor. It is my sacred duty as a duly elected United States Senator from the great State of Texas to lift my voice on the floor of the Senate for the protection of thousands of honest, God-fearing citizens of Texas. They have no other voice whatever except mine with which to register their opposition and resentment to this rotten political appointment of Joe B. Dooley, an appointment conceived in the mind of his political campaign manager, the present judge in the northern district of Texas, who desires to perpetuate his own rule through one of his faithful henchmen. It has also been fostered and developed by the attorneys and lobbyists of certain large railroad corporations. It could be possible that these railroads count on protection of this nature from suits filed against them by individual citizens and by the Federal Government for overcharge in rates during the wartime on transporting soldiers and fighting equipment which might be engineered by stooges of the most rotten and corrupt political dynasty that ever destroyed or attempted to destroy any nation—the New Deal dynasty.

Yet, Mr. President, I am simply and humbly performing the duties of my office as I see those duties. I am talking with all the vehemence at my command against the corrupt system which has been foisted upon the good people of this Nation during the last 14 years.

I have not one iota of enmity or bitterness in my heart against any person on the face of the earth. I firmly believe that it is possible to loathe the sin yet love the sinner. I am fighting for a principle. I do not agree that all those who have taken part in this sinister, diabolical plot are conscious of what they are doing or of the harm and damage they are doing to many people.

Yes, Mr. President, I am against the New Deal dynasty. I oppose and abhor every thread and fiber of it. To me it is the combination of communism, socialism, and all other dangerous foreign isms wrapped up into one bundle. By planning and blueprinting and plotting the New Deal system has created one emergency after another and piled emergencies on top of emergencies. By premeditated planning and relentless determination it has poured the accumulated billions and earnings and savings of our

people during the entire lifetime of our Nation down every rat hole in every nation on earth where a permit can be obtained to start pouring. At the same time through collaboration with labor-leader racketeers it has swung the ax in every direction in an effort to kill the goose that has laid the golden egg—our free private-enterprise system.

By incessant propaganda it has tarred and feathered those thrifty folks who would own their own homes or have a bank account, and pinned the badge of honor on grafters, loafers, character assassins, do-gooders, and bums. It has educated our rising generation to the idea that milk and honey do not flow from productive cows and busy bees, the maintenance of which requires labor and skill, but comes rather from sucking the Government sugar tit and milking the United States Treasury.

Double-talking bureaucrats and their press agents have succeeded in outbawling the babblers who attempted to build the Tower of Babel, and their last great Government project will probably be moving the Tower of Babel to New York Harbor, to replace the Statue of Liberty so that X will mark the spot where once stood the emblem of liberty representing a nation of rugged individualists, representing the end of that nation, which began March 4, 1933.

Yes, today we stand, Mr. President, with our pockets empty, nationally bankrupt, with a public debt larger than the mortgage-sale value of all the real and personal property in our Nation. This debt will not be paid off during the next 100 years. Yet we stand with our guns pointed at the heads of all bankrupt nations of the world demanding that they let us print some more paper money, and send it to them gratis by prepaid express. And if that is not fast enough, Mr. President, for some, we will send them our money printing plates by air express and let them print all of our United States money they want, such money to be redeemed at par by us when it comes back to our Treasury.

Yes, Mr. President, I am against all this tomfoolery. I want to get out of the rut. I want to get off this New Deal muddy detour and back on to the solid highway of sound prosperity and real American happiness.

Now, Mr. President, because I have consistently opposed all this skulduggery that has nearly wrecked and ruined our great Nation, I have been marked by the New Deal gang to be robbed of the right to perform my constitutional duty as a United States Senator to serve the honest citizens of my State in helping to select their Federal judges without being condemned for such action. If I had simply gone along with the crowd, Mr. President, if I had taken the easy path, Senators would not be hearing from me today on this subject. The nomination would have been made to order, painted snowy white, wrapped up in red, white, and blue colors, decorated with shining tinsel, and delivered to the most perfect New Deal stooge in Texas by Santa Claus in the White House, and some of the big New Deal newspapers in Texas would be running my picture on the front page with the title "The Great Texas Statesman."

But, Mr. President, I did not go along. I preferred to follow the Constitution. I preferred to do my own thinking—admitting, of course, that no man is infallible, that we all make mistakes. But I like the idea held by the wise framers of our Constitution, the idea that we should all think for ourselves, and not be yes-men or stooges or quislings. So I am merely plodding along in the old-fashioned, traditional American way, doing the best I can.

Now, Mr. President, after the wise framers of our Constitution got the system all worked out and written up and signed, they just kept on thinking, and they finally looked into the future and thought about me. Yes; they thought about me, Mr. President.

They may have said, "There may be some persecutions of public officials in the future, when an honest, conscientious, God-fearing Member of the United States Senate will be forced by his conscience to stand alone."

Yes; they thought about me. Mr. President, they also thought about Senator PAT MCCARRAN. They thought about Senator HARRY BYRD. They thought about the late Senator Carter Glass and the late Senator Josiah W. Bailey, those great men of the past. They thought about many other Senators who will possibly cross this great public stage in the future. They reasoned that in the future some lone Senator might have a good and valid reason for objecting to the confirmation of the nomination of someone from his State, and that the reason might be of such a nature that it should not be discussed upon the floor of the United States Senate. They reasoned that a Senator should be more familiar with persons and circumstances in his own State than Senators from other States would be, and that all Senators, being equal in power, should respect the judgment of any Senator on matters concerning his own home State. So they established what is known as the unwritten law of senatorial courtesy, one of the greatest unwritten laws ever established.

With few exceptions this unwritten law has been protected and preserved throughout all these years. The unwritten law of senatorial courtesy is just as sound when invoked and respected in the Senate as is the unwritten law which empowers a man to protect with impunity the sanctity of his wife in his own home when assailed by a powerful enemy of virtue.

Mr. President, it would be a phenomenon if two or more cases of this nature were exactly alike. Each case so far has been different, and perhaps all future cases will each be different. But if we sincerely bear in mind that it is the protection of the welfare of the people that is paramount, there is not the slightest possibility of any damage being done by the Senate through respecting the unwritten law of senatorial courtesy in each and every case.

In this particular case my colleague [Mr. CONNALLY] appears to be perfectly satisfied that the appointment of Mr. Dooley will serve the best interests of the people in the northern district of our State. I am equally certain that the appointment will not serve the best

interests of the people in that part of our great State of Texas. My colleague has admitted that there are many other highly qualified men who would serve the best interests of the people. Among the hundreds of highly trained and well-qualified men in that district, there are many who could obtain the wholehearted endorsement of both Senators from Texas. In that case the people of Texas would get the benefit of the full protection of their Senators, as provided in the Constitution, instead of one-half protection.

Mr. President, Senators who vote here today can enforce justice for the people of my State if they desire to do so. They can do it within the confines of their duties and responsibilities as United States Senators. If they fail to throw their full strength toward the side of simple justice, there will be a divided situation in the northern Federal district of Texas during the life tenure of Mr. Dooley. This will cause worries, doubts, distrust, and a further loss of confidence in the purity of our courts and the justice of our whole judicial system. This can all be avoided without doing any harm except possibly some degree of disappointment in the minds of some of the ringleaders who seek to dominate our courts by riding roughshod over the rights of the people.

Mr. President, it is a terrible situation when we consider that more than 500 common citizens outside the practice of law in the northern district of Texas have taken the time to write me saying that they believe this is a bad nomination and should not be confirmed. Those farmers have had a very sad experience with a wheat-cutting transaction. They sincerely believe that Mr. Dooley's firm was part and parcel of the plot. They know this firm of attorneys, and they know that Mr. Dooley has represented large railroad corporations throughout the years, and still represents some of them. They feel that if they were to go to court with the hireling of railroad corporations sitting on the bench, and present a case involving damage by the railroad to a cow, or some other damage, they might not get justice. I admit that they might get justice; but in the minds of those honest, God-fearing people, as this confirmation is pending, there is the feeling that if this nomination is confirmed they will not get justice. They have reason for their belief.

In addition to the opposition expressed by more than 500 citizens of the northern district of Texas to this nomination, at my own expense I conducted a secret poll by mail of the entire membership of the bar in the northern district of Texas, after the nomination had been sent to the Senate and the statement had been made time after time that Mr. Dooley had practically the unanimous approval and recommendation of members of the bar of that district.

The attorneys of my State know that for the past 14 years when a nomination has been sent to the Senate by the New Deal administration, it was practically a "cinch," and that they dared not raise their voices against a nomination at that stage for fear of reprisals should they ever come before that judge.

Mr. President, I am not an attorney. Some attorneys tell me that it is impossible for an attorney to take that position; yet I have received letters from some of the best attorneys in the State of Texas to that effect asking me not to divulge the names of the writers, and I have read into the record a letter from a judge in that district giving me information relative to the unfitness of Mr. Dooley for the position of Federal judge.

In that situation, with the mouths of lawyers closed as a matter of expediency, I conducted the poll to which I refer. I sent to each and every member of the bar listed in Martindale's Guide—more than 3,000 attorneys in that district—a letter and a postal card addressed to me. I asked them merely to write "yes" if they wanted Mr. Dooley's nomination confirmed, and "no" if they did not. I told them that they need not sign their names, so that there would be no chance of identification and no danger of reprisals if they expressed their own deep convictions, their own true opinions, their own true desires.

I am reliably informed that when that letter and all those post cards reached Texas the big insurance companies in Dallas got busy with the telephone and the big insurance companies in other cities got busy on long distance and commenced calling up attorneys all through the district saying, "For goodness sake, hurry up and write 'yes' on that post card and send it back."

But even with all of that campaign, 40 percent of the attorneys responding to that secret ballot in the district voted "no," Mr. President.

Does the Senate of the United States want to force down the throats of the members of the bar of the northern district of Texas a man who is repulsive to them, a man whom 40 percent of the attorneys in that district do not want? Surely not, Mr. President. Surely the Senate would not do such a thing.

It may be that I went out of the bounds of custom in asking the citizens regarding this nomination; but I was brought up as a common citizen, and I still believe that the rights of the common citizens of the Nation should be paramount. I believe their desires should be sought. I believe they should have a voice in the selection of their public officials. Yet here the only voice that the people of the northern district of Texas have in the selection of the most important public official in their life and in their territory is the voice of their junior Senator. They cannot come here and speak before the Senate. They have no opportunity to vote in connection with this nomination. They vote for the President or for the electors who elect the President. They vote for Senators and Representatives. They vote for their constables and for all their State public officials. But according to our Constitution, they have no voice whatever in the selection of the man who might pronounce the death sentence on one of them—no voice except the voice of either or both of their United States Senators who might carry their wishes to the other Senators on the floor of this great body.

We have one of the most unique systems that was ever established. As I

said in the beginning, it seems to me that the men who wrote the Constitution must have been inspired. They could look down the corridor of time and envision such a situation as exists here today—a result of corrupt politics—and still their system would enable this situation to be handled in a democratic fashion by every Senator with a free voice in the United States Senate being able to voice their objections.

Oh, yes, Mr. President; there have been a few recommendations of this man. There were some letters of recommendation put into the RECORD. I did not count them; I do not know how many—possibly 45 or 50. They were good recommendations, and I dare say that many of them came from good people. But 45 or 50 recommendations from 8,000 attorneys in the State of Texas would seem to me to be a very small percentage. The citizens of my State and the members of the bar are capable of writing strong recommendations, which they have the right to do. I do not question their right. I should like to have those recommendations placed along side of the recommendations sent in when there was a Federal judge nominated in the State of Virginia who was opposed by the late Senator Glass and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The RECORD is full of strong recommendations, strong editorials, regarding that Virginian. But there was something else involved in that nomination in Virginia. Although the man may have possessed all of the qualifications which were so beautifully described in the letters and in the editorials, the nomination was not confirmed by the Senate.

As Governor of the State of Texas—and any other governors know that the same thing is true, I believe—inspired petitions and letters would pour onto my desk whenever there was an appointment to be made. The men who received the most of the best letters were not always the best qualified men for the positions. We must give consideration to letters, but we must also give consideration to something of far more importance. We must give consideration to the fact of whether the Senate will sustain, preserve, and perpetuate the unwritten law of Senatorial courtesy.

There are many things which may cause a nomination to be personally obnoxious to a Senator. There are some things which, if a Senator should recite them as the actual reasons for the nomination being personally obnoxious to him, might cause untold damage to innocent people. That is the reason why it is unwritten law. Here is an organization of 96 men. During my almost 6 years here I have seen nothing except the most profound courtesy and respect shown by each Senator for all the other Senators. There is difference of opinion, yes; there are many differences of opinion; but each Senator respects the rights of the other Senators and honors his brother Senators.

There are other things to be considered. How would any Senator like to be unjustly charged with a crime, the penalty for which would be death, and a great deal of circumstantial evidence

were produced and many claims made pointing to him as the perpetrator of the crime? Suppose that man came before a judge to have his innocence or guilt determined, and the judge had never had any criminal-law experience in his life; he had always had a civil practice; had never had any judicial experience in criminal law and had never served as judge in any case except a small case 25 years previously. Would that man feel safe, Mr. President? Would he not rather have a man sitting on the bench who had put in a large portion of his life in the study and practice of both civil and criminal law and had had some little experience in sitting on the bench? Would not such a man feel more secure if that were the case?

The testimony of Mr. Dooley himself, as given before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, states that his law business has been chiefly civil practice.

Mr. President, at page 229 of the hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee we find that Mr. Dooley said:

My firm is Underwood, Johnson, Dooley & Wilson, at Amarillo. We have been together—that is, the majority of us—for quite some number of years—20, I would say. We have a general civil practice. We represent quite a good many individuals, relatively speaking. We have some corporate clients, including the Shamrock Oil & Gas Corp., which was mentioned here yesterday, and which, incidentally, is a relatively small concern, and independent.

All through the hearings we find there was no denial that Mr. Dooley is a civil-practice lawyer. Mr. President, I am not an attorney. There may be some Senators who have been attorneys who would think that the practice of civil law qualifies a man to administer criminal law; but it would take a great deal of argument to convince me of that fact if I were perfectly innocent and were haled before a judge and were charged with a criminal offense, if I knew that the judge had had practically no criminal experience.

At page 243 of the record we find that it is shown that Mr. Dooley said the following, when questioned by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]:

Senator DONNELL. Mr. Dooley, have you ever had any judicial experience at all, either as judge or special judge or special master or master in chancery, or anything of that sort?

Mr. DOOLEY. I served as a special judge in one case, Senator, a good many years ago; and that is the only direct experience of that kind.

Senator DONNELL. Was it a law case or an equity case?

Mr. DOOLEY. In our State it so happens that we do not have the close separation that you might have in your State between law and equity cases. We have the blended system there, and with us it was simply a lawsuit.

Senator DONNELL. Is that the only judicial experience you have had?

Mr. DOOLEY. Yes; that is the only experience serving as a judge.

Mr. President, I cannot help but believe, even as a layman, that a man naturally learns more and becomes more proficient in serving on the bench by sitting on the bench; and I think that a man who has never sat on the bench, except in one case, does not possess all

the qualifications that are essential to the position to which Mr. Dooley has been nominated, namely, the position of judge in the northern district of Texas, where more than 3,000 attorneys reside and practice.

So, Mr. President, there are many reasons why I object to confirmation of the nomination. I object to it, as I have said, because the nomination has been a build-up over a period of more than 3 years. It was on June 21, 1944, that Judge Wilson announced his intention to retire. More than 3 years ago Judge Wilson wished to leave public office, and he had a right to do so. But before he announced his wish to retire, those who were eager to get their hiring on the bench in the northern district of Texas had begun action. They did not wait until Judge Wilson announced his wish to retire. He announced it on June 21; but on June 12 the corporation lawyers and lobbyists of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad were busy in the city of Amarillo, where one of them lives, and in the neighboring towns, getting petitions. I have one of the petitions, and it is dated June 12. We also have the statement of Mr. Dooley, on the witness stand, that the petition in Amarillo was signed almost unanimously. However, according to the records, approximately one-half of the attorneys signed the petition. That is not unanimous, in my opinion.

So they got those petitions. After that, they began to find out that their candidate was not very well known, and had not had a great deal of experience to qualify him for this important position. So they started to give him a "build-up." They came before the Senate committee, nearly 3 years later, and bragged about the fact that Mr. Dooley was president of the Texas Bar Association. But, Mr. President, that argument is part of the campaign. Mr. Dooley was not president of the Texas Bar Association when those petitions were obtained on June 12, 1944; but they ran him for the presidency of the Texas Bar Association after that date, to give him a "build-up," so that they could brag about his being president of the Texas Bar Association.

Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect for the Texas Bar Association; and if a man came to the presidency of that association in the normal course of events, and was chosen by his associates in the practice of law to be president of that organization, and then later were to seek appointment as a United States judge, and were to use his presidency of the Texas Bar Association as an argument in favor of his appointment as judge, that argument might stand. But the argument in the present case falls flat as an argument for confirmation of the nomination, when we find that the position was sought and secured for the explicit purpose of using it as an argument to strengthen their case for having this man nominated.

So, Mr. President, I object to the nomination for that reason, as well as for many other reasons.

I recognize the right of all citizens to take part in petitioning their public officials regarding nominations. But when a great railroad corporation such as the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe does so,

that is different. That railroad has very large holdings in that district. It got not one of its lobbyists and attorneys, but at least two of them, to go out and beat the bushes. In fact, I do not know how many more of its lawyers and lobbyists it got to engage in that work, but I know that at least two of them rode to Washington on railroad passes, to appear before the Senate Judiciary Committee. As for the more than 500 common citizens in that section of the country who sent letters on this subject, it is rather difficult for some of them to dig up 3 cents for a postage stamp; and, of course, a letter might not have as much influence as the personal appearance of one of these polished, high-class attorneys and lobbyists representing the great Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad. I believe it is totally and wholly unfair for the Senate to bow down to these corporations and do their will, in the face of the opposition by the rank and file of the citizens of the northern district of Texas who may come under this judge in any case they have which comes up in that district. So I think it is unfair.

I also think it is unfair and it is wrong for a man to be selected and picked out from a firm of attorneys that has a record of being as close to the perpetuation of fraud against the taxpayers of the United States as does the legal firm of Underwood, Johnson, Dooley & Wilson in connection with the wheat-cutting deal at Amarillo, Tex. That was a deal whereby the farmers had given up 15,000 acres of their land in order that the Government might build the Pantex ordnance plant. They gave it up without a whimper, and they moved off within 2 weeks, and their crops were almost ready to be harvested. They moved off and left their crops, thinking their Government would do right by them.

Then along comes a partner of Mr. Dooley and hires out to the Pantex Corporation. The money that is paid for his services goes into the treasury of Underwood, Johnson, Dooley & Wilson. The money goes there for services in connection with obtaining the land and seeing that the title is good.

Then the Pantex Ordnance Corporation, a Government corporation, seeking its legal advice from a member of the firm of Mr. Dooley, got another man placed in there, and by some slick method they work out a contract for cutting the wheat. There are farmers all around Amarillo. The farmers who planted the wheat had combines with which to cut the wheat. They were in the business of cutting wheat, and they wanted to cut wheat. The current price for cutting wheat was \$2.50 an acre. Yet a contract was concocted by certain people so close to this firm that the farmers from around there write me that they believe the Dooley firm engineered the thing, and had a lot to do with it. This contract was concocted, which gave the contract to a certain individual, and then the son of the senior member of the law firm became one-third owner in the contract to cut this wheat at \$5.65 an acre.

It was such a stinking deal that the public, in disapproval, demanded that

the FBI investigate. The taxpayers of this country were cheated out of between \$14,000 and \$15,000, and one-third of it went to the son of the senior member of this firm of which Mr. Dooley is a partner.

An attempt has been made to whitewash this thing, to show that Mr. Dooley was sitting there in one of the offices, and that he was so inoffensive, so meek, and kind, and good, that he did not know that thing was going on. That is what he said, that he did not know anything about it.

No one ever charged that Mr. Dooley went out and got on one of those combine harvesters and drove it down the wheat field and cut the wheat, but there are many people who do believe that every partner in that firm should have some responsibility regarding that contract, which took out of the pockets of certain persons over \$14,000. It is not possible to change the minds of the citizens in that district who know about the matter. They think it was a rotten deal, and they do not think a member of that firm should be rewarded with appointment to the Federal bench, and that is what they consider this appointment to be.

Mr. President, that is another reason for rejecting the nomination, a good reason, a sound reason. The railroads in Texas are not the only railroads against which suit has been brought by the Federal Government because in time of war they overcharged for hauling our soldier boys, overcharged our Government for hauling munitions and weapons of war. A suit against practically every railroad in the United States has been instituted. Those railroads knew whether they were innocent or guilty. They had an idea whether they were going to be accused. There are smart men in those railroad corporations, and they know that if they can get one of their meek, inoffensive hirelings picked out of some big law firm and boomed up to a Federal judgeship, perhaps they will get a better deal if their case ever comes before that judge. They are not asleep.

I am not condemning the railroad corporations. They have a right to do that, and I have a right to tell the United States Senate if they do it. The responsibility rests on the United States Senate. If Senators want to confirm a man in disregard of that testimony, that is certainly their prerogative, and I have no criticism whatever to make, because, thank God, every Member of the Senate has a right to vote as he chooses to vote.

These are grave charges against this firm, and it is a big firm of attorneys, and an influential firm. I have introduced into the Record testimony on the part of a judge stating how they influenced other appointments in their district, how they swap the appointments around and get men out of their office into the Government judgeships, and then get people out of the Government back into their office, until it has become a very powerful organization.

There is reason to object to this nomination on many, many, many different grounds. Senators may take their choice. I am giving them a variety of reasons.

Mr. President, since the beginning of our Republic our Government has been recognized as a government of law, and not a government of men. Under such form of government the judicial branch is of great importance, because it officially interprets the laws enacted by the legislative branch. Too much stress cannot be placed on the selection of members of our judiciary.

On every hand for many years we have heard able attorneys denounce the corrupt judicial system of this Nation. They say that it has come to a low level. Prominent attorneys have told me that it is no longer wise, or the expedient thing to do, to select one's attorney on the basis of his experience and what he knows, but that the thing to do is to select an attorney, in case one gets into a law suit, on the basis of whom he knows on the bench, instead of what he knows.

All the complaint in this case comes from the knowledge which citizens have of the activities of Federal judges, and every one of them has been confirmed by the United States Senate. We cannot lay all the blame on the President.

Mr. President, it is not very often that objection is made on the floor of the Senate to the nomination of a Federal judge. This is the first time I have ever made objection to one here. It is not a very pleasant thing to do, but it is duty, and I am performing my duty in response to my own conscience and in response to calls from citizens of my State who have no other way to express themselves except through the voice of their junior Senator.

Mr. President, a bad situation confronts us, and there is another bad situation in the making right here today. This is where judges are made. They must be headed off here, or they will be on the bench for life. If there is any little shadow of doubt, I think we should give the benefit of the doubt to the people who are paying the salaries of the judges, and who will be governed by their decisions, instead of paying too much attention to the heart throbs of someone who anticipates the appointment.

To my knowledge it has never proved fatal to any aspirant or to any nominee who has been rejected by the United States Senate. Mr. President, our wise forefathers in writing the wonderful Constitution I have been discussing today placed responsibility of selecting Federal judges jointly on the shoulders of the Chief Executive and the United States Senate. At that time the sovereign States comprising the Union were looked upon as important factors in the Federal Government. To protect the welfare and interests of the people in the sovereign States each State was to be represented by two ambassadors or Senators, as they are called, sitting in the upper House of the legislative branch. Each Senator possessed equal duties and responsibilities with the other Senator. It is a great system, but if everything is true that I have been told with respect to a corrupt judicial system in the United States, it seems to me it is high time that a little more attention, a little more scrutiny, and a little more serious consideration be given to nominees for the Federal bench before they become judges.

There have been a few cases in which one Senator has risen on the floor, sometimes two Senators, objecting to a nominee as being personally obnoxious. The able chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has published a memorandum on the instances of personal objections. It has been discussed in the Senate. There is the case of a Commissioner of Immigration at the port of New Orleans, which was recommended and not again reported. Former Senator Reed at that time made the statement that the only thing against the appointee was the personal obnoxiousness objection made by the Senator from Louisiana, the late Senator Long.

The committee took the position then \* \* \* that if this were an office to be exercised wholly within the State of Louisiana the objection of the Senator would be conclusive, and we would report adversely on the nomination.

That has been held on down through the years, that when a Senator objects to a nomination of a person who is to serve wholly within the State from which the Senator comes, and the Senator says that the nomination is personally obnoxious, the Senate will sustain the objection. In the case cited, the duties of the office were not to be performed wholly within that jurisdiction. That is the statement made at that time by former Senator Reed.

Mr. BINGHAM. Even though the other Senator from the same State who is a personal friend of mine believes differently. The States are represented by two Senators, and if one of those two Representatives makes such a statement as was made on this floor by the junior Senator from Louisiana, no matter how much I may disagree with him on every position he takes—and I think it fair to state that probably there are no two Senators on this floor who are more divergent in their views on public questions than the junior Senator from Louisiana and I—nevertheless when he takes the position he has taken regarding this matter it seems to me that the only fair thing to do is to send the nomination back to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. Bingham said further:

On the floor this evening, in response to a question of mine, he suggested that the nominee is personally obnoxious to him, and it has been my practice during the 7½ years I have been here always to vote in accordance with any such preference expressed by a Senator, no matter on which side of the aisle he might be.

All through these cases it will be found that many Senators took the position that no one should know any more about whether a nomination was personally obnoxious than the man making the objection. The late Senator Glass brought that out very forcefully when he was before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I want to review that case here for a few minutes, because it bears on the appointment that is being considered now. When the committee was talking about hearing other witnesses who had come before them to testify in favor of the nomination, they asked Senator Glass whether he preferred to testify first, or whether he preferred to let the other witnesses come first. Senator Glass, with his unusual clarity of expression, said:

I think I should prefer to hear what those favoring the nomination have to say. For if they can tell me better than I know, myself, whether this nomination is personally offensive to me, I shall be greatly obliged to them.

That is the reason underlying that unwritten law. It was to place in the hands of every Member of this august body the right to defend himself, and to receive the respect of his colleagues in doing so.

I quote from the Roberts case:

The Senators from Virginia, in reply to the request of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for information concerning the nomination, said: "This nomination is utterly and personally offensive to the Virginia Senators, whose suggestions were invited by the Department of Justice, only to be ignored." This objection raises the question as to the custom of the Senate in the matter of senatorial courtesy when such objections are raised by a Senator as to a nominee from his State, and as to whether such objections shall be sufficient without the presentation of facts tending to justify such objections. This matter has not been in direct issue since 1913. It is evident that it should be considered by the full committee.

It is very interesting to take time to read the statements made by the Senators at that time. In the Boyle case, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] objected, in a statement before the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

The present nomination of William S. Boyle, now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, is personally offensive and personally obnoxious to the junior Senator from Nevada because of the foregoing and because the nominee has lent himself to a combination to take a slap at the junior Senator from Nevada and to demonstrate that whatever influence the junior Senator had in Washington had gone.

The nomination was rejected.

In the Roberts case the then junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] stated, in part, as follows:

It is my sincere and honest conviction that this nomination was made for the purpose of being personally offensive to the Virginia Senators, and it is personally offensive to the Virginia Senators, and is personally obnoxious to me, as well as to my colleague. I am well aware of the responsibility that I take in making this statement of complaint of personal obnoxiousness, but I want to say to the committee that I make that complaint with full knowledge of that responsibility as a Senator from Virginia.

The nomination objected to by the Senator from Virginia was rejected.

The case before the Senate is almost an identical case. As I previously stated, each and every case is somewhat different from the other. But in the Roberts case an attempt was made to belittle and humiliate and embarrass both Senators from the State of Virginia. The case now before the Senate is one intended to humiliate and embarrass the junior Senator from Texas. If there is any place where a United States Senator can be most effectively embarrassed it is in his own home town. Conduct the execution on the courthouse lawn of his home town. So, Fort Worth, the city in which I have lived ever since I have been in Texas, from which we have had a United States district judge for 70 years, was

picked out, and those who wish to humiliate me said, "This is where we will embarrass the junior Senator. We will show the people of his own home town that he has no influence whatever in Washington. We will simply railroad into office a man who lives 340 miles away from Fort Worth." I use that word "railroad" advisedly, because the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe pulled him in on a double-header.

Mr. President, I want to make it absolutely clear that if the Senate permits the use of this body as a political weapon, the present case may sooner or later have an effect on every Senator. The United States Senate is being used as a political weapon in this case. The White House has been used, the Judiciary has been used, the House of Representatives has been used, and now attempt is being made to use the United States Senate as a political weapon. If it can be used as such in my State it can be used in the State of every Senator.

Mr. President, the Senate is to vote on the nomination at 4 o'clock this afternoon. I have a great deal of information on my desk which I have not had time to place in the RECORD. It is highly important. But it appears to me that I have given ample reasons for the rejection of the nomination. Since the nomination came before the Committee on the Judiciary I have been informed that some new and vital evidence bearing on the nomination of which I believe the Committee on the Judiciary should have the benefit, exists.

I have been informed that the retiring judge, Judge Wilson, who is known by many people in Texas as the campaign manager for Mr. Dooley, has been striving in every way possible to name his own successor. There are many who do not believe in a judge naming his own successor. I have not had time to go into all the charges which have been made, but I have been informed that some advantage lies in a judge naming his own successor, the advantage accruing by reason of appointments in receiverships being given to members of his own family, or to firms of attorneys who employ his own son, and that such appointments are very lucrative; that a retiring judge would hate to see all his friends kicked out or all his friends, whom he hopes to have appointed in the future, have no chance to be appointed in the case of receiverships. So it might be that Judge Wilson wants to name his successor. The charge has been made by many attorneys that he has sought from the very beginning to name his successor, and that he would like to see that successor be Joe B. Dooley, of Amarillo.

I read a long letter from the judge which he wrote me on the 10th day of January of this year, which indicated that he was not entirely unfriendly to Joe Dooley. He had about as many nice things to say about Mr. Dooley as any of the other attorneys that have written in. Several of them have said some pretty nice things about him, and many of those who wrote and said the nice things about him are respected citizens of our State. But of all the letters that have come to my attention not as many

have been in favor of Mr. Dooley as have been opposed to him.

Judge Wilson, who has been on the bench about 27 years, I believe, proceeded to give me a little political advice, and, goodness knows, I need it. I am no politician. I am simply a common citizen who accidentally fell into the position he now occupies, and is trying to do the best he can. Many people in Texas were responsible for placing me here, because we still secure our Governors and United States Senators in Texas by election. The reason I happened to be elected to office four times was because more people voted for me than for my opponent.

Mr. President, if Judge Wilson has any desire or intention to name his successor I do not believe it is a good thing. I do not believe he should have anything to do with naming his successor.

As I previously stated, the letter he wrote to me gave me some political advice. I shall not take time to read the letter again. It is already in the RECORD. Judge Wilson began his letter by saying that he noticed in the newspapers that I was thinking about running for reelection next year. Possibly such a statement was contained in the newspaper, but I have not announced as yet whether I will run for reelection. I will announce my intention in due time, and in plenty of time.

The judge proceeded to tell me what a terrible thing it would be for me to get all the attorneys against me by opposing the Dooley nomination. Each of those attorneys is going to have a vote, and they have a great deal of influence. I think the advice the judge gave me was good advice. But what am I to do? Should I take the advice of that able jurist, Judge Wilson, and crawl back into my hole and pull my hole in after me, and not say anything about this abominable nomination, merely so that I shall have less resistance, less opposition individually if and when I run for reelection? I could have taken such a course very easily. I could simply have ignored the nomination and not said anything against Mr. Dooley. Then the attorneys the judge was speaking of might have thought, "O'DANIEL is all right. He is a good fellow. He did not interfere with our putting this thing over."

But there are some other people in Texas. They commenced to ask me, "What are we going to do? It would be terrible to have Joe Dooley on the bench. We do not want him. What shall we do? There was nothing they could do except tell me. The nomination had already been made. So it was for me to choose between duty and expediency. I chose duty, and decided to oppose the nomination on the floor of the Senate.

It may be that all the attorneys in the northern district of Texas and their connections in the other districts of Texas will be angry at me. If I choose to run for reelection they may persuade their wives and families to go along with them, and build up a great deal of opposition to me in case I should run again. But I cannot help that. I have never given consideration to such things when I ran.

I simply got my name on the ticket and started to run.

However, I do know that 40 percent of the attorneys who responded to my poll do not want Mr. Dooley. I do not believe that they would fight me. I did not know at that time that there were so many opposing his nomination. From all that I had heard, it was difficult for me to believe that there was a single solitary attorney who could possibly be against Mr. Dooley.

The big railroad attorney, Mr. Pipkin, attorney for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe at Amarillo, testified on the stand that he knew practically every attorney in Amarillo. He had been there for a great many years. He said that he did not know of another man in the entire city of Amarillo who had the qualifications that Mr. Dooley had. He almost indicated that there was no other attorney in Amarillo capable of handling this job. He did not say exactly that, but the way he said it, it sounded that way.

I have a great deal of respect for Amarillo and for the attorneys of Amarillo. Amarillo is in my State. But the judge was trying to persuade me, if not to threaten me with reprisals if I dared to oppose the nomination of his candidate, Mr. Dooley. Now look at me. Here I am opposing it.

The judge proceeded to tell me that he himself was not entirely dumb about politics. He pointed out that he knew something about politics. Naturally I think a great deal of the opinions of some of our judges. But the judge had been trying to get out of this job down there since June 21, 1944.

We must get a picture of this thing to show him it all happened. It is often difficult to paint a picture for Senators so that they will all understand the situation. However, I am plodding along and doing the best I can to present a picture.

The New Deal political gang in Texas wanted to time this nomination so that it would come out exactly right in connection with certain primary elections in Texas. They had to figure these things out, and take into consideration a great many factors. They do not have very much else to do, so they work day and night to figure out how to get rid of those who are fighting the New Deal.

This was in June 1944. I did not come up for reelection until the following year. At that time the New Dealers in Texas were not trying to execute me politically on the town square of my home town of Fort Worth. Such an effort would not have had much effect. They wanted to get as close as they could to the time when I would be due to run for reelection, in case I decided to run, so they kept postponing the nomination.

The judge told me that the powers in Washington said to him, "Please stay on the bench until we whip Germany." When I heard that I obtained the record of nominations, and learned that the nominating machinery of our great Government never slipped a cog. It continued to function during the war like a well-oiled piece of machinery.

There was not a hitch anywhere. Nominations were submitted and considered, and confirmed or rejected. There were thousands of them. But the judge was told, "Stay on, because we are at war with Germany. Just wait until Germany goes down."

He waited patiently. He wanted to get out. Finally Germany went down.

It is not General Wilson that I am talking about. It is Judge Wilson. He was not a general. He was not fighting the war. He was a judge in the northern district of Texas. I have never been able to find out what he had to do with the war so far as his official position was concerned.

Mr. Dooley could have taken this job at that time, I presume. However, the New Dealers were not through grooming him, dressing him up, and getting him ready for the race. They had to run him through as president of the Texas Bar Association, and do a few other things to dress him up so that he would look like a judge, before they brought him out too far. So they commenced to tell Judge Wilson from Washington, "Now that Germany has gone down, please stay on until Japan goes down. We must fight another war, Judge. We must whip Japan. So you stay on the bench until Japan goes down, and then perhaps we will let you out."

The 1948 election was drawing closer and closer. Mr. Dooley's sponsors were continually putting off the nomination, for reasons which seem very weak to me.

After Japan went down, we had no one else to whip. Our enemies had all surrendered. The war was over. Then Mr. Dooley's friends tried to delay a little longer, until August 9, 1946. August 9, 1946, is a very significant date, because of its proximity to another significant date. On August 9 the senior Senator from Texas, who had been carrying Judge Wilson's resignation around in his pocket undated, dated it August 9 and sent it to the President, all the time bearing in mind that the elections in Texas were drawing nearer and nearer.

Finally the nomination was started on its way. It did not reach the Senate until the 8th of January, 1947. That was about 6 months ago. Since that time the nomination has been under consideration.

There was another reason for Judge Wilson writing me that three-page letter. There was a great deal contained in the letter which was very significant. When he wrote that letter he did not want me to do anything that was wrong; he did not want me to oppose this man. He was a "good man." He thought that if it came up just before my election—that is, if I should run—my opposition to Mr. Dooley would do me a lot of harm. So he sent the letter to me and in it he pointed out something that would be a terrible catastrophe, something that was not anticipated by some of the people who were in on the plot of which I am speaking. They did not realize that the people of this Nation would get fed up on the New Deal and change in the election. That election threw the fear of God into many of the New Dealers in Texas. They woke up and said, "My goodness gra-

cious! The Senate will be dominated by Republicans and we have not yet got Mr. Dooley confirmed. Maybe we will get a little justice out of the Senate. Maybe nominations will not just slip through. Maybe there will be a little hesitancy—if for no other reason, a political reason. Maybe the Republicans in power will scrutinize Democratic nominations a little more closely."

They became worried about it. I did not know how badly they were worried until after the committee had finished consideration of the nomination and sent it to the Senate, and then I was informed Judge Wilson had written another letter. He was worried about the situation here, and he got to thinking that if he could get the President to appoint Mr. Dooley as an interim appointment during the recess of Congress, Mr. Dooley would be sitting right on the bench when the Senate came back, and therefore he would have a distinct advantage.

I never saw the letter which he wrote, but I am told that he wrote a letter to President Truman urging something along that line. I have been told by someone who claims to know exactly what was in the letter. Whatever was in it I think should have a good deal of bearing on this nomination; and it appears to me that the nomination should be recommitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee so that the committee can get the letter, or a copy of it, and see exactly what it contains. As I have said, I never saw it, but I have good reason to believe that the letter exists or that it did exist. It may not exist at this time, but it did exist, according to my informant. If it did exist, there should be some copies of it, so that we may know what was in it. I can see no harm, inasmuch as this nomination has been put off since June 21, 1944, in sending it back to the committee for a few days so that the committee can get the rest of the evidence, if it is able to get it.

I referred the matter to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee as soon as I heard about it. I wrote him under date of July 25, 1947, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Judge James C. Wilson, both before and since his retirement, has campaigned for the appointment of Joe Dooley as his successor. I doubt seriously if the Dooley appointment would have been made had it not been for the campaign waged by Judge Wilson in his behalf. I recently learned from a reliable source in Texas that Judge Wilson has had considerable correspondence with the President and probably the Attorney General urging and demanding the appointment of Dooley.

After the November elections, Judge Wilson wrote the President and insisted upon Dooley's appointment being made immediately as he was afraid the Senate, composed of a majority of Republican Members, would delay or refuse to confirm Dooley unless he was already on the bench. It is my information that this letter contained remarks which were derogatory to me, and coming from Dooley's campaign manager, Judge Wilson, would probably reflect the attitude of Dooley himself. Since I have repeatedly stated that this nomination was personally obnoxious to me, I think this letter is material, not only on that subject, but also on the subject of

whether or not a lifetime judge should be permitted to choose his successor.

Since I have no means of securing the correspondence between Judge Wilson and the President and the Attorney General, I respectfully urge your honorable committee to secure copies of all the correspondence bearing upon this nomination for your use as well as mine.

Sincerely yours.

That letter was signed by me.

I understand that when the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee received that letter he laid it before the committee. I know that he called me immediately and said the committee would like me to make an effort to get the letter, and if I was unable to get it, I understood that he or the committee would make an effort to get it. So, immediately upon receipt of that information, I wrote a letter to the President, which was as follows:

JUNE 30, 1947.

The President,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am informed Judge James C. Wilson, of Fort Worth, Tex., wrote a letter to you on or about November 22, 1946, urging that you make an interim appointment of Joe B. Dooley, of Amarillo, Tex., to succeed him and giving some of his reasons and opinions. I have asked Attorney General Tom Clark for a copy of this letter, and have also asked Chairman A. J. WILEY, of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to secure a copy of same for me. Mr. WILEY took up the matter of my request with his committee today, and he now says that I should ask you for copy of the letter so I can give same to him.

I believe this letter should be considered by the committee and the Senate in connection with Mr. Dooley's appointment, and respectfully ask that you furnish same to me.

With kindest personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

W. LEE O'DANIEL,  
United States Senator.

I wrote a letter on the same date to the Attorney General, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
June 30, 1947.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have been requested by Chairman WILEY, of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to ask the President and you for a copy of a letter written by Judge James C. Wilson, of Fort Worth, on or about November 22, 1946, to the President requesting an interim appointment for Mr. Joe B. Dooley.

I have already asked you to secure a copy for me, and I am enclosing letter I have addressed to the President. I will appreciate any help you can give me in securing this letter because I feel it should be rightly considered by the Judiciary Committee and the Senate.

With best personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely yours.

That letter was signed by me.

I have a reply dated July 7, 1947, from the Attorney General, which reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1947.

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,  
United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: I have for reply your letter of June 30, addressed to the President, as well as the copy thereof

forwarded to me, requesting a copy of a letter written by Judge James C. Wilson, of Fort Worth, Tex., on or about November 22 to the President of the United States, with reference to an interim appointment in the office of United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

The correspondence of the President of the United States has always been considered, of necessity, confidential. This precedent must be followed in this instance.

I regret very much my inability to comply with your request.

Yours very sincerely,

TOM C. CLARK,  
Attorney General.

Thereupon I wrote, under date of July 7, 1947, to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], as follows:

JULY 7, 1947.

The Honorable A. J. WILEY,  
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to your suggestion I wrote the President, and the Attorney General, asking for a copy of the letter written by retiring judge, James C. Wilson, of the northern judicial district of Texas to the President 11-22-46 bearing on the appointment of Joe B. Dooley as his successor.

I now attach hereto copy of letter I have just received from the Attorney General, refusing to give me a copy.

It now appears that if the Judiciary Committee is to have the benefit of this important letter bearing on the appointment of Joe B. Dooley, it must obtain same through some other source than me.

From information given to me, this letter has an important bearing on the nomination, and certainly the Senate Judiciary Committee should not be denied the right to review such important evidence. I trust you will make an effort to obtain the letter under discussion.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. President, I should now like to read an Associated Press article from Amarillo, Tex., dated July 3:

JUDGE WILSON DENIES WRITING TRUMAN TO GIVE JOB TO DOOLEY AS O'DANIEL DECLARES IN SENATE

AMARILLO, July 3.—Judge James C. Wilson, of the Federal court for the northern district of Texas, denied here Thursday he had ever written President Truman urging the appointment of Joe B. Dooley as his successor.

(During the Senate debate Wednesday on Dooley's nomination to be judge for north Texas, Senator O'DANIEL said he had heard that Wilson had written a letter November 22 to the President suggesting Dooley be given an interim appointment before Congress convened last January 3.)

"I never," Wilson said, "urged the President to appoint any man to this position. After Dooley was nominated for the judgeship I did urge his quick confirmation. I didn't do that because I was for Dooley, but because I wanted a judge to succeed me so I could retire."

Wilson sent Senator CONNALLY a telegram Thursday giving him permission, with approval of the President, to let CONNALLY have all of his correspondence with President Truman.

The telegram said:

"O'DANIEL insisting Dooley matter be referred to Senate committee; to get my correspondence with President Truman. This was while this Congress was in session, I think possibly in March. This is my consent for you to have all this correspondence.

"It does not deal with Dooley, but about changing terms of my retirement, which I approve, if President wanted it that way. After first two letters were passed between us (Wilson and the President) our further correspondence at that time was purely personal; had no relation to this matter whatsoever, but if President sees fit to turn it over it is entirely agreeable with me. This is only correspondence I have had with the President."

O'DANIEL said Thursday he had asked Truman if it is true he received a letter from Wilson, a resident of Fort Worth, suggesting the nomination of Dooley.

The Senator said he had written letters to the President and Attorney General Tom Clark asking if they knew of such a letter, and to make it available if it exists.

The purpose of an appointment, O'DANIEL said, would be to give Dooley a better chance for confirmation by a Republican-controlled Senate.

The Senate will vote on the Dooley nomination Tuesday.

So, Mr. President, according to that Associated Press dispatch, Mr. Wilson disclaims having written such a letter, for he is quoted as saying, "This is only correspondence I have had with the President."

In my opinion, such a statement constitutes a claim that he did not write the letter which I have been informed he did write on or about November 22. Under such circumstances, when Mr. Wilson states, according to the Associated Press dispatch, that he did not write the letter, and when I have it on good authority that the letter was written and was received by the President, I think it is the duty of the Senate to find out whether such a letter was written and, if it was, what was in it. That is one reason why I have moved that the nomination be recommitted.

MR. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

MR. O'DANIEL. I yield.

MR. WILEY. In order that the RECORD may show the action taken by the Judiciary Committee, let me state that pursuant to the direction given yesterday telegrams were sent to the President, to the Attorney General, and to Judge Wilson. In reply, the following letter has been received from the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 8, 1947.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have your telegram of July 7 in which you ask me to deliver to you a letter written to me by Federal District Judge James C. Wilson, of Texas, in November 1946. The letter you refer to was a personal letter, so I am unable to comply with your request.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

I have also received the following letter from the Attorney General:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, July 8, 1947.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With reference to your telegram of July 7, concerning a letter

written by Judge James C. Wilson, on or about November 22, 1946, I beg to advise that no such letter was written to me.

I am advised that the letter referred to was a personal one written to the President and I am informed is now in the files at the White House.

I have previously furnished this information to Senator O'DANIEL.

Regretting my inability to serve you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

TOM CLARK,  
Attorney General.

A telegram went out to Judge Wilson at the same time. In reply, I have received the following telegram, dated at Fort Worth, Tex. on July 7:

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,  
Washington, D. C.:

Your wire just now read to me by my secretary at Amarillo, Tex. We are 350 miles apart. She keeps the files. Of course I might find them if I had time, but, dear Senator, I want to say to you and your committee that I wrote no letter to either Senators O'Daniel or Connally or Attorney General Clark or the President favoring the appointment of Mr. Joe B. Dooley or any other candidate prior to his making the appointment. I decided to stay out of it because of so many friends of the bar who were prospective applicants. I had only one correspondence with the President. I think it was in March this year. The first two letters had only to do with my retirement. It occurred to me he had made a slight change in the conditions of my retirement and I was writing to let him know if he wanted it that way it was all right with me. The balance of the correspondence with him was purely personal, not pertaining to this matter in any way whatsoever. If the President is willing, this is my consent for you to see all of that correspondence now. As to Attorney General Clark, I think it was in September last year Senator CONNALLY wrote me in Montana disclosing a controversy was on as to whether there should be a vacation appointment by the President of his nominee. I do not recall whether he had made his nomination or not at that time. In any event, CONNALLY was for and Clark against a vacation appointment. I not only agreed with Senator CONNALLY, but was rather critical of Mr. Clark as to his mistreatment of me in asking me to wait until after Germany went out and in later asking me not to retire until Japan went out, all of which I had agreed to. I thought he ought not to ask me to enter into another waiting period. I did not know, considering the program that had been planned by the Republicans, when such a trivial matter as the confirmation of a judge would ever be reached. In the meantime I could not retire unless I did so arbitrarily, which Senator CONNALLY advised me not to do. If any question you and your committee want to ask me about this matter, please call me up in the morning.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. WILSON.

MR. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the letter the Senator from Wisconsin has received from the White House admits the existence of a letter of November 22, does it not?

MR. WILEY. I shall read the letter again. I do not have before me the telegram which I sent. It was rather lengthy, and recited the action taken by the Judiciary Committee. The President's letter to me, which was delivered at this desk just this afternoon, reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 8, 1947.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have your telegram of July 7th in which you ask me to deliver to you a letter written to me by Federal District Judge James C. Wilson, of Texas, in November 1946. The letter you refer to was a personal letter so I am unable to comply with your request.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

MR. O'DANIEL. I think that letter is important because it confirms the existence of a letter of November 1946. It is further confirmed by the letter from Attorney General Clark, and it has been reported to me. Yet in the Associated Press report from Amarillo the judge denied he ever wrote any letter on the subject at that time. It appears to me that it would have a great bearing, and by all means be given consideration by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. It could be obtained by different means, including a subpoena upon Judge Wilson, who in spite of the President's words to the contrary, denies having written the letter. The only way it can be given consideration by that committee is for the Senate to recommit the nomination to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and the motion I have made is that it be so recommitted, and I trust the motion will be carried.

MR. President, how much time have I remaining?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. FLANDERS in the chair). Twenty minutes.

MR. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

MR. O'DANIEL. I yield the floor, and will take my 20 minutes later.

MR. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think I am entitled to close the argument. I cannot keep the junior Senator from Texas from taking his seat, although the Senator from Arkansas wanted him to yield.

MR. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I want to ask the junior Senator from Texas a question or two.

MR. CONNALLY. Does the Senator want to ask me a question, or the junior Senator from Texas?

MR. McCLELLAN. The junior Senator from Texas.

MR. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas desires to ask me a question I yield to him for that purpose, and it may be taken off my time.

MR. McCLELLAN. I wish to get something clear in my mind about the issue before the Senate. I certainly have no personal interest in it. This is one of the most difficult votes I have had to cast since I have been a Member of the Senate. It is not because of any political significance, because the matter has absolutely none in my State.

I wish to observe and respect the traditional practice of not confirming anyone who has been appointed to a State position, or to a Federal position within a State, who is personally obnoxious to one of the Senators. I wish to adhere to that rule and that custom. I can appreciate that it serves a good purpose

in many instances. I also appreciate that it can be and is sometimes abused.

As I understand, the junior Senator from Texas has interposed that sort of objection, using the term "personally obnoxious." If the nominee is personally obnoxious to the Senator, for some strictly personal reason, then I shall not vote to confirm him. But I want to know and be assured that the "obnoxious" is associated with the "personally," and I want it to be the individual who is personally obnoxious. If the nominee is said to be personally obnoxious because of any relationships, or associations, or any action on his part which actually, directly or indirectly, affected the junior Senator from Texas, then I want to respect the rule. But if the obnoxiousness stems from the Senator's disagreement with the present administration as to its policies—and I have not always agreed with the administration, and do not always vote as the administration wants me to vote—if that is the basis of what is now termed "personal obnoxiousness," and not the individual who is the nominee, then I think I can determine how I should vote. I should like to have the Senator clarify that.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have spoken for some time on this subject. I appreciate the question from the Senator from Arkansas, and I realize the importance of the question.

I have said that all through the previous cases which I have reviewed it has been the outstanding consensus of opinion throughout the years of prominent Senators that if a Senator states that a nomination is personally obnoxious to him, that is as far as the Senator should go. Then the other Senators based their act of supporting or not supporting the senatorial courtesy rule on the fact that the Senator stated that the nomination was personally obnoxious. It was brought out that if a Senator throws the responsibility on the other Senators to decide whether or not a certain act or acts constituted sufficient grounds for personal obnoxiousness, there is no need for the rule whatever.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not caring at the moment about what some other Senators have done, and what may have been done in this or that particular case. The personnel of this body changes, and I do not feel rigidly bound by all the precedents of the Senate. What I want clarified is this—and the Senator is the only one who can answer the question—is the appointment of this nominee, because of his character or lack of character, because of his lack of professional qualifications to fill the position to which he has been appointed, or because of any act he has ever done which directly affected the Senator from Texas, personally obnoxious to him?

The Senator can answer that question. I am asking for no details, but if the nominee has committed any act toward the Senator which affected him so that it has made the nominee obnoxious, I shall know what to do. I do not care about what other Senators have

done in respect to other issues, but if the obnoxiousness stems from a disagreement with the President, or the present administration, or the New Deal, or whatever we may care to term it, if that is the reason why the nominee is obnoxious, I think I know what I shall do.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does the Senator want to place himself in the position of being the judge as to whether or not the thing I have in mind makes the nomination personally obnoxious?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not understand there is any obligation on the part of the President necessarily to consult me before he makes an appointment in my State; I try to maintain that relationship, but I know of no law that compels him to do it. But what I am trying my best to ask the Senator is, whether, because the Senator is in disagreement with the President of the United States and his policy of making appointments, if the Senator's position stems from that, then I might disagree with the Senator as to what the term "personal obnoxiousness" means, and I am entitled to place my interpretation on that. If that is the basis, then I think I might exercise my discretion, and not ask the Senator to tell me what is in his mind.

I am only asking the Senator whether he will state on the floor of the Senate that this man—not a system, not the New Deal, not an administration, not the President of the United States, not his policies, but this man, this individual—is personally obnoxious because of some act of his.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am certainly glad to restate the fact that the nominee, Joe B. Dooley, is personally obnoxious to me, and the nomination is personally obnoxious to me.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOORE. Has the Senator some time remaining in which I might make a statement?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall be glad to yield the Senator whatever time he desires, if I have that much time left.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MOORE. I feel, because of my participation in this matter, that I should make a statement, in justice to all parties concerned, including the Senate, including the two Senators from Texas, and including Mr. Dooley.

I was chairman of the subcommittee which first took testimony with respect to the nomination, and a great many witnesses appeared from Texas, prominent lawyers and other prominent citizens of Texas. The senior Senator from Texas, having served a long time on the Committee on the Judiciary, and having served on other committees to which appointments have been sent for consideration prior to confirmation, knows that witnesses who come forward to testify on behalf of the appointment are usually witnesses who paint the capacities and capabilities of the appointee in very glowing colors. In this case no witness who appeared before either the subcom-

mittee or the full committee questioned the qualifications—I want to make that plain, because I want to be fair about it—who questioned the qualifications or the character of the nominee. I have said that before, and I repeat it. Certain witnesses appeared, even from my own State. Many witnesses from the State of Texas, who are friends of mine, have told me, by letter, by telegram, by telephone conversation, and in person, that, in their judgment, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] has not been treated right in the State of Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I dislike to interrupt him.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator can answer me in his time. I have only 10 minutes, and I think I should like to make this statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MOORE. I know the power of the senior Senator from Texas. I know the power of the present administration, and I think I know something about the standing the junior Senator from Texas has with reference to the administration. I would be very dumb if I had not observed it. The senior Senator from Texas has power that I am not envying at all or questioning. He has the power to nominate whomever he pleases for appointment in Texas, because he has been strictly an administration man, as I look upon it. That is not said in criticism. He is responsible for the appointment of the Attorney General, Tom Clark; I know that. Of course, it is a common understanding that the junior Senator from Texas has not been regarded or considered in the matter of nominations. The junior Senator from Oklahoma occupies the same position, but probably for different reasons. I happen to know, and it is a great good fortune to me to know, a great many people in the State of Texas, business firms and professional firms. I have every confidence that whatever is done by the Senate will not operate as an effective purge of the junior Senator from the State of Texas, because that purge has been attempted, as we all know—it is common knowledge—by the executive department of the Federal administration, by the House of Representatives, and by the judiciary; and now, as the Senator says, this is in effect an attempted purge by the Senate. I do not agree with that. I do not think the Senate can purge the Senator from Texas. I know the people of Texas are an independent sort—they would have to be rather broadminded to have elected, time and again, the senior Senator from Texas and the junior Senator from Texas. They are men of diametrically opposite political views. But the people of Texas can do things of that kind.

I merely want to say that, so far as the junior Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, I believe I can safely make it a rule, while I have the privilege of serving on the Judiciary Committee, that if the two Senators from the State in which an appointment is made approve the nominee, I shall go no further, unless serious charges be made; because I think

it is a safe rule, and I believe that that is the rule I shall continue to follow.

I have no quarrel with the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. I have a great, a high regard for him, as well as I have for the junior Senator from the State of Texas. I do not want to get into a fuss or quarrel with any Member of the United States Senate. I think it was the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who read the precedents on the question of personal obnoxiousness. It lies, in my judgment, in the personal conscience of each Senator as to how he shall vote upon it. As for myself, I know that anything I am saying now could not change the views of any other Senator. I am not speaking for that purpose. I am speaking only in order that the RECORD may show the view that I have taken. I hope the RECORD will disclose the fact that I have attempted to be fair in every particular and have not been influenced by political considerations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The remaining time is at the disposal of the senior and junior Senators from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not want to take too much time on this matter. I served with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on the original subcommittee that considered the Dooley nomination. I listened with great interest, part of the time, to the junior Senator from Texas. I did not have the opportunity to listen to him all the time, because there were other things I had to do. The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary took time on this matter to hear witnesses. There has been a suggestion made by the junior Senator from Texas that the matter was delayed. It may have been delayed in clearing the appointment through the office of the Attorney General. It may have been delayed from the time the name was suggested, insofar as the White House was concerned, in sending the name to the Senate. But if there was any delay in the Committee on the Judiciary or in the subcommittee, it was only because the committee wanted to hear all the witnesses possible from Texas, because we knew that there was a difference of opinion existing between the two Senators from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I merely want to make it clear that evidently the Senator from Washington was not present all the time, as he admitted, because I have endeavored to make it perfectly clear and plain, at least twice in my statement that I have no criticism whatever but only words of praise for the Committee on the Judiciary. I attribute no delay whatever to their methods.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate what the Senator says. I merely wanted to make it clear that we had this nomination for 2 or 3 weeks. It required time for witnesses to come from Texas. I know that on one or two occasions the junior Senator from Texas requested

further time because of certain documentary evidence and witnesses he wanted to present to the committee.

We can go only by the official records of the Committee on the Judiciary and of its subcommittee, regarding the nominee. I listened to every witness. So far as I could find, here was a man nominated to be a Federal judge, who had been a lawyer for many years in Texas. Naturally he belonged to a law firm. It was a prominent law firm, and as the junior Senator has pointed out, the firm probably had a variety of clients. I suppose they represented some little fellows and some big ones. All lawyers who practice law for any period of time, particularly if they are connected with a successful law firm, have that experience. Mr. Dooley was a prominent member of that law firm. He was honored by the lawyers of Texas, themselves, by being elected president of the Texas Bar Association. Insofar as I could ascertain from the record, and knowing something of law practice myself, Mr. Dooley was the average, substantial, Texas lawyer, representing many types of clients. The firm also, I suppose, represented many types of clients.

Nothing at all was said in the subcommittee against Mr. Dooley's personal character. As a matter of fact one lawyer testified the only thing bad he knew about Mr. Dooley was that he was such a good lawyer and so devoted to the interest of his clients that he did not attend church on Sunday because often he was working in his law office. But insofar as he was personally concerned, as a citizen in his community, there was not one single word said against Mr. Dooley.

In the history of every law firm—I believe there are three or four members of Mr. Dooley's law firm—there can be found, no doubt, lists of cases which have been tried over a period of years in connection with which the litigants have become angry with one another, one side thinking it is right and the other side thinking it is right. In such circumstance by means of innuendo and the casting of suspicion the idea can easily be spread that perhaps such-and-such a lawyer did not do quite the right kind of a job, or that the clients he represented were not the right kind of clients. It is difference of opinion that brings about lawsuits. I do not care who the individual is, if he practices law in his community and represents his clients adequately, vigorously, and earnestly, he is going to make enemies. Oftentimes the lawyer on the other side of a case may become angry as a result of losing the case. I suspect Mr. Dooley was successful in his appearances before the trial courts of Texas.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] read to the Senate a considerable number of precedents respecting personal objection of United States Senators to nominees to high posts such as the post of a Federal judge. I am not thoroughly familiar with the practice in this respect. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and I, as members of the subcommittee looked up the precedents as well as we knew how,

and it seemed to me that we ended by reaching the same conclusion as that reached by our distinguished chairman, that it became a matter for each individual Senator to decide for himself.

It also seemed to me that in most cases, when a United States Senator says that a nomination is personally obnoxious to him, at some place, somewhere, either in executive session in the Committee on the Judiciary, or whatever committee of the Senate is considering the nomination, or on the floor of the Senate, in writing, or orally, or both, the Senator objecting should suggest in what way the individual was personally obnoxious. It may be something he would not want to make public. As the distinguished junior Senator from Texas well said, it may be something about the man which, if made public, might cause harm to many innocent persons, including members of his own family or someone near him. But somewhere, at some place, those who are to pass on the nomination should be given some inkling respecting the cause of the individual being personally obnoxious, before the Senate, in my opinion, should invoke the rule.

I am a member of both the subcommittee handling the nomination and the full Committee on the Judiciary, and I yet have no inkling, either in writing or orally, from anything said or communicated to the full committee or on the floor of the Senate, as to just why Mr. Dooley is personally obnoxious. I deem the word "personally" to mean exactly that in connection with the expression "personally obnoxious."

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal about Texas politics, and I strongly suspect that the nominee is somewhat politically obnoxious to the junior Senator from Texas. Probably he is politically obnoxious to some of the residents of the judicial district in which he lives, because it is my understanding—and I received considerable education along that line in the hearings—that the intensity of politics in Texas almost makes it inevitable that one becomes personally obnoxious to someone when taking sides politically in that great State. But I have heard no reason assigned for Mr. Dooley being personally obnoxious to the junior Senator from Texas.

It has been said on the floor of the Senate that many lawyers in his own district opposed Mr. Dooley. I do not know how many lawyers there are in that district, but the number is probably in excess of 3,000. Anyone who has practiced law will realize that there are always members of the bar who, for various reasons, do not particularly like to see another member of the bar go on the Federal bench. But no one who had such objections appeared before the committee. No one appeared before the committee and said anything against Mr. Dooley personally.

I think the Senate can well take the real proof of the pudding to be that only in the past 2 years, I believe, or 3 years, Mr. Dooley was honored by all the lawyers in Texas, including the 3,000 living in his own Federal judicial district, by being elected president of the State Bar Association of Texas. He has been long active in the State Bar Association, and

that association put its stamp of approval on him.

In the committee the nomination was not considered as a partisan matter. The distinguished chairman also heard many of the witnesses, examined the record very carefully, and voted for the confirmation of Mr. Dooley after the hearings were concluded.

The very expert constitutional lawyer, member of the committee, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], whom everyone in the Senate knows is very meticulous and thorough respecting every dot and dash and every crossing of a "t" in the evidence and in the testimony, also spent considerable time examining the nomination. He came to the conclusion that Mr. Dooley was not only a fit and proper person for the judgeship, but that he probably was one of the outstanding lawyers in that section of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Did the Chair correctly understand the senior Senator from Texas yielded 10 minutes to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. I yield one additional minute to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], himself a very distinguished judge in Kentucky before he came to this body, a man who knows the duties and who must have some idea of what the qualifications of a Federal judge should be, also, after listening to all the testimony and examining the record carefully, came to the conclusion that Mr. Dooley was a proper and fit nominee for the position. Other Members, after examining the record and hearing the witnesses, came to the same conclusion.

Mr. President, it seems to me there probably may be some other lawyers in that judicial district who might serve as ably in the position as Mr. Dooley, but surely the nomination which has been made, whether it was suggested by the senior Senator or the junior Senator from Texas, in the absence of any proof of unfitness or disqualification, should be confirmed.

Mr. President, I may say that several Representatives in Congress from the northern district of Texas testified before the committee. My old friend, Representative EUGENE WORLEY, who comes from the district in which Mr. Dooley lives, and with whom I served in the House, and in whom I have the highest confidence, appeared before the committee and testified in Mr. Dooley's favor.

Mr. President, after this very thorough examination by the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, coupled with the fact that the evidence does not show anything concrete as to why Mr. Dooley might be personally obnoxious to any Member of this body, and coupled with the further fact that Mr. Dooley himself did nothing out of the way during the hearing, and did not attempt to suggest to any Senator how he should vote on his nomination, it seems to me the Senate should not invoke the rule strictly, but after considering all the facts in the case and in light of all the prece-

dents, should decide that Mr. Dooley is a very able and fit nominee for the position. I hope the Senate will confirm his nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the 10 minutes which I shall have at my disposal I can only briefly express my views with regard to the nomination. I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I never have been. I was judge in a modest way when I first came to Congress 34 years ago. I do not regard the pending nomination or any similar nomination as involving any constitutional right on the part of a Senator. The Constitution gives the President the power to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint officers, among whom are the judges of our courts.

Because Senators are supposed to know the people of their respective States better than do others, it has become customary to consult Senators with respect to the appointment of judicial or other officers within the State. As a rule that practice has been justified by the results. But the President of the United States is not required by the Constitution to do so. Only recently he exercised the right of appointment in the State of Texas without consulting either Senator, when he sent to the Senate the nomination of Mr. R. EWING THOMASON, a Member of the House of Representatives for many years, without consulting either Senator with reference to the appointment. Neither Senator objected to it, and the nomination was confirmed.

I mention that because it illustrates what I am undertaking to say, that there is no constitutional right residing in any individual Senator with respect to confirmation of the nomination of a man appointed from his State, although the custom has grown up over the years to consult Senators from the State with reference to appointments within the State. So I do not think there is any constitutional right involved on the part of either Senator from Texas or any other Senator under similar circumstances, that the Senate is required either by the Constitution or by precedent or practice to observe.

It has always been a matter for each Senator to determine whether, under the circumstances, any Senator who advances a personal objection to an appointee should be required to show some ground for such personal objection. I have never believed, and I do not now believe, that any Senator has the right to object merely from caprice or from a whimsical desire to defeat the nomination of someone for an office.

Soon after coming to the Senate I had a little experience which probably has colored my view on the subject. I believe that each Senator is under an obligation to the Senate to have a bona fide reason for an objection on the ground of character, misconduct, or mistreatment of a personal nature which might be regarded as creating an obnoxious and embarrassing situation growing out of an appointment.

Many years ago when I first came to the Senate the Republican Party was in power. I think Mr. Hoover was President. It was either in the early days of Mr. Hoover's administration or the closing days of Mr. Coolidge's administration. The nomination for reappointment of a district attorney was sent to the Senate. I had been a candidate for the Senate in an election only a short time prior to the nomination. The district attorney who was involved had campaigned against me offensively. The things which he said were offensive. They were unnecessary to be said in a political campaign.

I gathered up all the newspapers containing such offensive declarations and brought them to Washington with me, with a view of possibly objecting to the confirmation of his nomination on the ground that he was personally obnoxious to me.

The late Senator Norris, of Nebraska, was chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I gathered up all the documents and all the charges and everything that this man had said about me in a political campaign and took them one night to Senator Norris' home to consult him as to whether he thought I would be justified in making an objection on the ground of personal obnoxiousness.

Senator Norris read over the clippings from the newspapers. Finally he said:

This was a political campaign. While it used to be the rule in the Senate that any Senator might make an objection on personal grounds, and would not be asked about it, but his objection would be accepted and observed, yet of late years the Senate has been more inclined to expect at least that a Senator who gives such ground for opposition to an appointee shall give some reason so that the Senate may have an opportunity to judge whether the rule of personal obnoxiousness ought to apply when there is no other ground against the appointment.

After I had discussed the matter with Senator Norris, the chairman of the committee, I decided not to interpose an objection to the reappointment of my Republican friend from Kentucky. His nomination was considered and confirmed, and he was appointed, and, I believe, served out his term.

I was always glad after that—and I am now—that I did not take advantage of what I might have done at the time by raising the question of personal obnoxiousness. This man had been very vigorous and rather denunciatory in a political campaign in his effort to keep me from coming to the United States Senate. I think I acted wisely in the decision which I reached. I have no way of knowing what the result might have been if I had interposed a personal objection. Perhaps if I had read to the Senate some of the things which this man said about me, the Senate might have concluded that I had a pretty good ground for looking upon him as personally objectionable.

I mention that circumstance for whatever it may be worth in confirmation of what Senator Norris said to me at that time, namely, that in recent years the Senate has come to a rather different viewpoint in regard to objections based upon personal obnoxiousness with respect to a candidate whose nomination

comes before the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator makes out a very strong case for himself. Probably he would have been justified had he interposed an objection at that time. However, as I understand from the evidence in this case, the junior Senator from Texas is not even acquainted with Mr. Dooley. There has never been any proof of misconduct upon his part, or mistreatment of the junior Senator from Texas. There is not a single fact in the record anywhere which would justify an objection on the ground of personal obnoxiousness.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the observation of the Senator. I was coming to that point. It presents a contrast between the situation which I have described, involving an appointment from my State, and the present case. I do not cite that example because of any virtue which attaches to me, or because of any merit on my part in not raising the objection, but only in confirmation of the statement that in recent years the Senate has come to expect a United States Senator who raises such an objection to give some ground for the objection. I could have done so in the case to which I referred. However, after discussing the matter with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I felt that under the circumstances I would not be justified in raising that objection.

Mr. President, no similar situation has been presented here. I dislike to become involved in a controversy between Senators from the same State over an appointment. But, after all, I am charged with a constitutional duty. I am charged with the duty of passing upon the question whether this man is qualified to be a judge. No one has said that he is not qualified—not even the Senator who objected to his appointment. No one has attacked his character. No one has in any way sought to undermine his standing at the bar or among the people of Texas. I am asked to vote against the confirmation of his nomination on the basis of a whimsical or capricious objection on the part of a Senator who never saw him in his life until he appeared before the committee in his own defense. So far as anyone knows, or so far as the committee has been informed, the nominee never uttered a sentence against the junior Senator from Texas, either politically, personally, or otherwise.

The other day the junior Senator from Texas sent all of us a copy of a letter which Judge Wilson, of Texas, had written him. In his covering letter the Senator stated that he was sending us a significant letter from the judge.

I know Judge Wilson. He was a Member of the House of Representatives when I was elected to Congress in 1913, and served in the House for 6 years after I came to Congress. He was appointed a judge by Woodrow Wilson. He has been on the bench for 28 years. He is over 70 years of age, and is entitled to

retirement. He wrote the letter to the junior Senator from Texas urging that the appointment be made and confirmed so that he could exercise the right he enjoys under the law to retire.

Is there anything wrong with that? Is there anything significant about it? The only thing was that he would like to retire but could not do so until there was a new judge appointed.

He went on in that letter to say that so far as he was concerned he would be glad if any one of three men were nominated; that any one of them would be a good judge. He was not consulted about them. He mentioned Mr. Dooley and two others whose names I do not now recall. He said that inasmuch as Judge Dooley had been nominated, and not either of the other two whom he had in mind, he hoped that the Senator from Texas might assist in bringing about the confirmation of Judge Dooley. I presume he would have written the same sort of letter about any of the others if the same circumstances justified it. He hoped that he could bring about confirmation so that he might exercise his right to retire, under the law, having served for 28 years and reached beyond the age of 70 years.

I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in extending me this time. I cannot find in my heart, under all the circumstances, how I can do otherwise than to vote for the confirmation of this nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, like many of my colleagues, I dislike having to make a choice which involves the personal feelings of two of my colleagues, but, as a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I feel it is my duty to state as briefly as I can my own views about this particular case.

I was not a member of the subcommittee and did not hear all the evidence, but as many of the Senators know, this matter was taken up by the full committee and much of the evidence was rehearsed before that committee, so that I did have the advantage of hearing most of the testimony relating to it.

The first point I think may be said to involve the qualifications of Mr. Dooley as a lawyer and as a man fitted to discharge the duties of a Federal judge. I do not think there is any serious question about that feature of the case. There was no real evidence brought before the committee which would cast any doubt, in my opinion, on the legal ability, the integrity, or the character of Mr. Dooley. So that the real subject in controversy involves the question centering around the concept known as personal obnoxiousness involving a Senator. My own feeling about it is that it is a valuable concept, one which has served a good purpose, and one which I think should be protected in this body, but I think that it is based upon the idea that there must be reasonable grounds for it, some grounds relating to the person involved, in this case Judge Dooley, and also involving in this instance the junior Senator from Texas. I was unable, in listening to the evidence before the com-

mittee, to find anything that could tie the idea of personal obnoxiousness to the junior Senator from Texas. Much of the evidence which was adduced and which, in the Senator's view, made the nominee, Mr. Dooley, subject to the charge of personal obnoxiousness, did not relate to their personal relations at all, but, if they had any significance, went to the qualifications of the nominee. I am unable to see in any evidence that was brought before the committee the elements of personal obnoxiousness in the sense that I understand that term has significance before the Senate. So far as I can see, nothing had taken place between the junior Senator from Texas and the nominee; in fact, if I recall correctly, they were not acquainted; no expressions by the nominee had ever taken place involving the junior Senator from Texas. The only thing I could see that was brought out, aside from the political situation which may exist in Texas and in the National Administration, was the fact that the nominee is not from Fort Worth. Most of the judges heretofore appointed have been from Fort Worth. It does not seem to me that the residence of the nominee should be a basis for the charge of being personally obnoxious.

I admit that the distinction in the precedents which were developed by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in a very exhaustive memorandum on the subject was difficult to follow. I believe that in practically every instance with which the Senate has dealt there has been some kind of personal relationship, which, even though it might not appear very significant to those who were not involved, yet could reasonably be of great significance to the Senator who was involved in the particular case. Practically every one of them undertook to state reasons for the individual's being personally obnoxious. I do not think any of them were entirely capricious, although they might strain our reason in some instances. But in this case I am unable to find anything in the record—and I certainly did not hear anything before the committee—which would indicate any kind of personal relations between the junior Senator from Texas and the nominee, Mr. Dooley. Therefore, I am compelled, much as I dislike making a choice, to vote to confirm the nominee on the floor as I did in the committee. I believe that in so doing I am not destroying the idea of personal obnoxiousness in the Senate. On the contrary, I think that by making proper distinctions where they should be made we will strengthen for the future the idea sought to be advanced here in those cases in which I believe it should be applied and in which I think the facts would justify its application.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate it was my privilege to study much of the record and much of the testimony with respect to Mr. Dooley.

There were various circumstances which, in my judgment, required rather a careful investigation and study. The investigation and study were made by a member of the staff of the Judiciary Committee, but it was likewise my privilege to look into the facts with respect to various portions of the subject matter.

In addition to the study of the record and the hearing of the testimony to which I have referred, it was my privilege to meet and converse with Mr. Dooley, whom I had previously never seen, so far as I know, and also to observe his demeanor during the progress of the hearings. I observed him to be a modest, calm, collected gentleman. While there were various questions to which he might very well have taken some exception or which might have aroused some excitement or temper on his part, I observed that he was able to contain himself and did so very admirably.

In my judgment, from my observation of him, Mr. Dooley is a man of high standing, of excellent judgment and capacity, and I believe that he would serve with distinction upon the Federal bench.

I have considered, Mr. President, in addition to my observation of Mr. Dooley personally and a study of that portion of the record, at any rate, to which I have referred, and that portion of the testimony to which I have referred, various letters with respect to Mr. Dooley. One of those letters contains a paragraph which I think is particularly significant and important. I refer to a letter from Mr. James L. Shepherd, Jr., whom I have known for some years and who was formerly president of the Texas Bar Association. I have known him personally in the American Bar Association. He is with the firm of Baker, Botts, Andrews & Walne, of Houston, Tex., which is one of the great law firms of the Southwest. I quote this from Mr. Shepherd's letter to me:

There can be no question about the fact that the nominee is peculiarly well fitted for this position. He is a man of the highest character, of splendid ability as a lawyer, eminently fair, of a quiet, balanced and judicious temperament, and in every way preeminently qualified for this position. He is not a New Dealer, but a man who believes as you and I do in the basic soundness of our method of Government and is deeply interested in seeing that it is preserved. He was president of our State bar 2 years ago and the speeches which he made during that year are matters of record in this State. No one could read them without being satisfied as to the basic soundness of his social, economic, and political views. I have known him intimately for over 35 years and I am speaking from my own observation and information and not from hearsay.

Mr. President, I close by stating that I was greatly impressed by a testimonial which was placed in yesterday's *Record* by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. That testimonial was a telegram signed by approximately 15 former presidents of the Bar Association of the State of Texas. I observe that the first name on the list is that of an old friend of mine, a former president of the American Bar Association, David A.

Simmons, of Houston. The sentence which contains their expression reads as follows:

As former presidents of the State Bar Association of Texas we unanimously certify to the character and ability of Joe Dooley, and endorse him for United States district judge.

Mr. President, I shall vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Dooley.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Each side has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNALLY. Perhaps the junior Senator from Texas wishes to speak at this time.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, this matter has been fully discussed within the time we have had to discuss it. At 4 o'clock we shall vote first on the question whether the nomination shall be recommended to the Judiciary Committee for its further consideration. There is some new evidence which should be considered by the committee. I think we would be wise to consider that evidence before we vote on the question of confirmation. That evidence is important; because if the letter, as reported to me by a reliable source, was written, it certainly should receive consideration. That letter was supposed to have been written by the retiring judge, James C. Wilson, last November 22 to the President of the United States; and in writing that letter Mr. Wilson was, as a great many people in Texas realize, acting in the capacity of campaign manager for Mr. Dooley, and was trying to name his successor. Judge Wilson is reported to have written to the President urging him to make an interim appointment so that the new appointee would be on the bench and would be in a better position to obtain confirmation than otherwise. In that letter some very derogatory statements are also made against the junior Senator from Texas, and I should like to have the Senate Judiciary Committee see them.

The existence of that letter has been verified this afternoon by the President in his letter which comes from the White House. In that letter he acknowledges that the letter to which we have referred is in existence, but he refuses to send it, because he states that he considers it to be confidential. In contrast to that we have an Associated Press report quoting Judge Wilson as saying that he never wrote the letter. So we see there is a conflict; and it seems to me that, in justice to the nomination, the conflict should be inquired into and given consideration by the Judiciary Committee. I do not believe any harm will be done in trying to iron out this inconsistency. If the letter is in existence, the Judiciary Committee and the entire Senate have a perfect right to find out what is in it, and that can be ascertained by various methods.

Therefore, I wish to suggest that we do not vote blindly on this matter, but that we obtain all the information before we vote.

So I ask that the Senate vote to recommit the nomination to the Judiciary Committee. The nomination has already been under consideration since

June 21, 1944, and I do not think any harm will be done by delaying it a few days longer, so that we may know what are the facts with reference to whether the judge was campaigning with the President and was trying to appoint his own successor to the judgeship of the northern district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate to pay attention to what I shall say in the next few minutes, because I have only 4 minutes remaining.

In regard to the motion to recommit, let me say that today we have heard it said that the President received a letter from Judge Wilson. The President has written a letter stating that he regards the letter from Judge Wilson as personal, and that he will not disclose it. Judge Wilson has sent a telegram in which he states that the letter refers to his retirement, and does not have any relationship to the appointment of a new judge.

I know personally that Judge Wilson has been anxious for some time to retire. So his letter was merely a letter to the President asking that he be allowed to retire.

Mr. President, this nomination has been before the Judiciary Committee since last January. We know the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] who spoke a moment ago. He knows all about this case; he has thoroughly examined it. The committee was called back several times at the request of the junior Senator from Texas, who wanted to have a further examination made by the committee. That was done three or four times. Even if we stay here 6 months, we shall not be able to make the President divulge his private correspondence.

Mr. President, the undisputed testimony in this case is that Mr. Dooley is a distinguished lawyer of the highest character, and has been president of the State of Texas Bar Association, and has been a distinguished lawyer for many years. Nevertheless, the junior Senator from Texas says Mr. Dooley is personally obnoxious to him. However, the junior Senator from Texas refuses to tell the Senate why Mr. Dooley is personally obnoxious to him.

The other day the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] asked the junior Senator from Texas the direct question, "Tell us why Mr. Dooley is personally obnoxious." The junior Senator from Texas replied, "Under the precedents, I do not have to do anything except say he is personally obnoxious."

Mr. President, I have before me the printed record of the committee hearings, and it shows that the junior Senator from Texas did not know Mr. Dooley until he met him in the room of the Judiciary Committee. The testimony is that Mr. Dooley did not know the junior Senator from Texas until they walked into that committee room. The testimony further is that Mr. Dooley has never said anything against the junior Senator from Texas, never has done anything against him, never has taken any part in any of his campaigns.

So, Mr. President, how can Mr. Dooley be personally obnoxious to the junior Senator from Texas, when neither one is known to the other, when Dooley is innocent of all harm and all wrong, and has never done or said anything against the junior Senator from Texas? How can he be personally obnoxious under those circumstances? The obnoxiousness must not be political; he must be personally obnoxious.

Mr. President, under this testimony it is physically impossible for Mr. Dooley to have been personally obnoxious to the junior Senator from Texas. He may be politically obnoxious; but the junior Senator from Texas has no right to make such a claim, because Mr. Dooley is not a politician. He is a lawyer, and only a lawyer, and has never done anything against the junior Senator from Texas.

Yet the junior Senator from Texas says this is a diabolical, sinister plot. Evidently, Mr. President, I am the plot, for I recommended Mr. Dooley. I never talked to the President about the case in my life. Mr. Dooley does not know the President, and neither does the President know Mr. Dooley. I submitted his name, and sent testimonials from his district, from the lawyers and judges and the people generally; and the President subsequently nominated Mr. Dooley.

It has been stated here that the junior Senator from Texas was never consulted about appointments. However, Mr. President, the record shows that he was consulted about this appointment, and that he made two recommendations. The record shows that on the executive calendar as of today, there are the names of two district attorneys whom the President has appointed on the recommendation of the junior Senator from Texas. Yet it has been stated that the junior Senator from Texas has never been consulted, but has been ignored. Nevertheless, two district attorneys, whose nominations are on the calendar at this time, have been nominated by the President. Despite the abuse which the junior Senator from Texas has heaped upon him from time to time, the President has appointed two district attorneys on the recommendation of the junior Senator from Texas, and their names are now on the calendar, for confirmation. Those are facts. I ask the Senate to take my word for it that those are facts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to recommit to the Committee on the Judiciary the nomination of Joe L. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|         |          |           |
|---------|----------|-----------|
| Aiken   | Brewster | Buck      |
| Baldwin | Bricker  | Bushfield |
| Ball    | Bridges  | Butler    |
| Barkley | Brooks   | Byrd      |

Cain  
Capehart  
Capper  
Chavez  
Connally  
Cooper  
Cordon  
Donnell  
Dworshak  
Eaton  
Ellender  
Ferguson  
Flanders  
Fulbright  
George  
Green  
Gurney  
Hatch  
Hawkes  
Hayden  
Hickenlooper  
Hill  
Hoey  
Holland  
Jenner

Johnson, Colo.  
Johnston, S. C.  
Kem  
Kilgore  
Knowland  
Langer  
Lodge  
Lucas  
McCarran  
McCarthy  
McClellan  
McFarland  
McGrath  
McKellar  
McMahon  
Magnuson  
Malone  
Martin  
Millikin  
Moore  
Murray  
Myers  
O'Connor  
O'Daniel

O'Mahoney  
Overton  
Pepper  
Revercomb  
Robertson, Va.  
Robertson, Wyo.  
Russell  
Saltonstall  
Smith  
Sparkman  
Stewart  
Taft  
Taylor  
Thomas, Okla.  
Thye  
Tydings  
Umstead  
Vandenberg  
Watkins  
Wherry  
White  
Wiley  
Williams  
Young

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 46, as follows:

## YEAS—39

|           |              |                 |
|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| Baldwin   | Eaton        | Martin          |
| Ball      | Ferguson     | Moore           |
| Brewster  | Flanders     | O'Daniel        |
| Bricker   | Gurney       | Revercomb       |
| Bridges   | Hawkes       | Robertson, Wyo. |
| Brooks    | Hickenlooper | Saltonstall     |
| Buck      | Jenner       | Smith           |
| Bushfield | Kem          | Stewart         |
| Butler    | Langer       | Taft            |
| Byrd      | Lodge        | Thye            |
| Cain      | McCarthy     | Watkins         |
| Capehart  | McKellar     | Wherry          |
| Dworshak  | Malone       | Williams        |

## NAYS—46

|           |                 |                |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------|
| Aiken     | Holland         | O'Mahoney      |
| Barkley   | Johnson, Colo.  | Overton        |
| Capper    | Johnston, S. C. | Pepper         |
| Chavez    | Kilgore         | Robertson, Va. |
| Connally  | Lucas           | Russell        |
| Cooper    | McCarran        | Sparkman       |
| Cordon    | McClellan       | Taylor         |
| Donnell   | McFarland       | Thomas, Okla.  |
| Ellender  | McGrath         | Tydings        |
| Fulbright | McMahon         | Umstead        |
| George    | Magnuson        | Vandenberg     |
| Green     | Millikin        | White          |
| Hatch     | Moore           | Wiley          |
| Hayden    | Murray          | Young          |
| Hill      | Myers           |                |
| Hoey      | O'Connor        |                |

## NOT VOTING—10

|          |              |        |
|----------|--------------|--------|
| Downey   | Maybank      | Wagner |
| Eastland | Reed         | Wilson |
| Ives     | Thomas, Utah |        |
| Knowland | Tobey        |        |

So Mr. O'DANIEL's motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States judge for the northern district of Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "yea." If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is unavoidably absent as announced by the Senator from Illinois on the previous vote. If present the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas is unavoidably detained on committee business of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his immediate family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to recommit the nomination to the committee.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate. I am informed that if he were present, he would vote "nay." If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is unavoidably detained, the airplane on which he was to return to Washington today having been grounded because of adverse weather conditions. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, and who would vote "nay" if present, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas is unavoidably detained on committee business of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his immediate family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is unavoidably detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, and who would vote "yea" if present, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 36, as follows:

## YEAS—48

|              |                 |                |
|--------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Aiken        | Hill            | Myers          |
| Baldwin      | Hoey            | O'Connor       |
| Barkley      | Holland         | O'Mahoney      |
| Capper       | Johnson, Colo.  | Overton        |
| Chavez       | Johnston, S. C. | Pepper         |
| Connally     | Kilgore         | Robertson, Va. |
| Cooper       | Lucas           | Russell        |
| Cordon       | McCarran        | Smith          |
| Donnell      | McClellan       | Sparkman       |
| Ellender     | McFarland       | Taylor         |
| Fulbright    | McGrath         | Thomas, Okla.  |
| George       | McMahon         | Tydings        |
| Green        | Magnuson        | Umstead        |
| Hatch        | Millikin        | Vandenberg     |
| Hayden       | Morse           | White          |
| Hickenlooper | Murray          | Wiley          |

## NAYS—36

|           |          |                 |
|-----------|----------|-----------------|
| Ball      | Eaton    | Martin          |
| Brewster  | Ferguson | Moore           |
| Bricker   | Flanders | O'Daniel        |
| Bridges   | Gurney   | Revercomb       |
| Brinks    | Hawkes   | Robertson, Wyo. |
| Buck      | Jenner   | Saltonstall     |
| Bushfield | Ken      | Taft            |
| Butler    | Langer   | Thye            |
| Byrd      | Lodge    | Watkins         |
| Cain      | McCarthy | Wherry          |
| Capehart  | McKellar | Williams        |
| Dworshak  | Malone   | Young           |

## NOT VOTING—11

|          |              |        |
|----------|--------------|--------|
| Downey   | Maybank      | Tobey  |
| Eastland | Reed         | Wagner |
| Ives     | Stewart      | Wilson |
| Knowland | Thomas, Utah |        |

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 494. An act to reorganize the system of parole of prisoners convicted in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.); asked a conference

with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'HARA, Mr. ALLEN of California, and Mr. ABERNETHY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONES of Ohio, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GORE, and Mr. NORRELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3950) to reduce individual income-tax payments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58) authorizing and directing the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, to make a change clarifying the effective date of the motor-fuel tax, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 665. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pretenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho;

S. 666. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school buildings in Owyhee, Nev.;

S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate;

S. 816. An act to repeal the Post Roads Act of 1866, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946;

S. 1231. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the issuance of certain public-improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 1421. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3333. An act to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

## REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by me to House bill 3950, to reduce individual income-tax payments, just received in a message from the House of Representatives, and I request that it be referred to the Committee on Finance, be printed, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment (in the nature of a substitute) intended to be proposed by Mr. LUCAS to the bill (H. R. 3950) to reduce individual income-tax payments: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947.'"

"SEC. 2. Increase in personal exemptions.

"Section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits of individual against net income) is hereby amended by striking out '\$500', wherever appearing therein, and by inserting in lieu thereof '\$650', and by striking '\$1,000' and by inserting in lieu thereof '\$1,300'."

"SEC. 3. Reduction in surtax on individuals.

"Section 12 (b) of Internal Revenue Code (relating to rates of surtax) is amended by striking everything after the colon and inserting in lieu thereafter the following:

"If the surtax net income—The tentative surtax shall be:

|                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Not over \$2,000-----                | 13 percent of the surtax net income.               |
| Over \$2,000 but not over \$4,000.   | \$260, plus 15 percent of excess over \$2,000.     |
| Over \$4,000 but not over \$6,000.   | \$560, plus 19 percent of excess over \$4,000.     |
| Over \$6,000 but not over \$8,000.   | \$940, plus 23 percent of excess over \$6,000.     |
| Over \$8,000 but not over \$10,000.  | \$1,400, plus 27 percent of excess over \$8,000.   |
| Over \$10,000 but not over \$12,000. | \$1,940, plus 31 percent of excess over \$10,000.  |
| Over \$12,000 but not over \$14,000. | \$2,560, plus 36 percent of excess over \$12,000.  |
| Over \$14,000 but not over \$16,000. | \$3,280, plus 40 percent of excess over \$14,000.  |
| Over \$16,000 but not over \$18,000. | \$4,080, plus 43 percent of excess over \$16,000.  |
| Over \$18,000 but not over \$20,000. | \$4,940, plus 46 percent of excess over \$18,000.  |
| Over \$20,000 but not over \$22,000. | \$5,860, plus 49 percent of excess over \$20,000.  |
| Over \$22,000 but not over \$26,000. | \$6,840, plus 52 percent of excess over \$22,000.  |
| Over \$26,000 but not over \$32,000. | \$8,920, plus 55 percent of excess over \$26,000.  |
| Over \$32,000 but not over \$38,000. | \$12,220, plus 58 percent of excess over \$32,000. |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| "If the surtax net income is:          | The tentative surtax shall be:                       |
| Over \$38,000 but not over \$44,000.   | \$15,700, plus 62 percent of excess over \$38,000.   |
| Over \$44,000 but not over \$50,000.   | \$19,420, plus 65 percent of excess over \$44,000.   |
| Over \$50,000 but not over \$60,000.   | \$23,320, plus 68 percent of excess over \$50,000.   |
| Over \$60,000 but not over \$70,000.   | \$30,120, plus 71 percent of excess over \$60,000.   |
| Over \$70,000 but not over \$80,000.   | \$37,220, plus 74 percent of excess over \$70,000.   |
| Over \$80,000 but not over \$90,000.   | \$44,620, plus 77 percent of excess over \$80,000.   |
| Over \$90,000 but not over \$100,000.  | \$52,320, plus 80 percent of excess over \$90,000.   |
| Over \$100,000 but not over \$150,000. | \$60,320, plus 82 percent of excess over \$100,000.  |
| Over \$150,000 but not over \$200,000. | \$101,320, plus 83 percent of excess over \$150,000. |
| Over \$200,000 -----                   | \$142,820, plus 84 percent of excess over \$200,000. |

"Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make such changes in the tables in section 400 (optional tax table) and section 1622 (withholding tables) as may be necessary to reflect the reduction in taxes provided for in the preceding provisions of this act.

"Sec. 5. The amendments to the Internal Revenue Code made by this act shall become effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947."

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 107. An act for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California; and for other purposes;

H. R. 859. An act to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3247. An act to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3350. An act relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3494. An act to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the Regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3505. An act authorizing an appropriation for investigating and rehabilitating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the vicinity of Lake Mechant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3539. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof;

H. R. 3541. An act to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3569. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof;

H. R. 3598. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Pacific coast and creating the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission; and

H. R. 3672. An act to create an Academic Advisory Board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

H. R. 3767. A bill to provide for the protection, preservation, and extension of the sockeye salmon fishery of the Fraser River system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 175. An act to confer upon the Governor of Alaska the power to pardon and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against laws of the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 187. An act to amend Public Law 304, Seventy-seventh Congress;

H. R. 205. An act to amend the act approved May 7, 1934, granting citizenship to the Metlakatla Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 734. An act to amend the act of February 12, 1925, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1337. An act authorizing a per capita payment of \$50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the transfer of the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the board of road commissioners in the Territory of Alaska to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1932;

H. R. 1609. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to provide for the exercise of zoning power in town sites on the public lands of the United States;

H. R. 2361. An act to authorize the filing of actions in State courts to quiet title to lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818;

H. R. 2484. An act to authorize the payment of certain sums to jobbers in connection with their logging of timber for the Menominee Indians on the Menominee Reservation during the logging season 1934-35, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2825. An act to provide additional funds for cooperation with public-school districts (organized and unorganized) in Mahanomen, Itasca, Pine, Becker, and Cass Counties, Minn., in the construction, improvement, and extension of school facilities to be available to both Indian and white children;

H. R. 2938. An act to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497, 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 3153. An act to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota;

H. R. 3173. An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3322. An act to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3323. An act to enable the Osage Tribal Council to determine the bonus value of tracts offered for lease for oil, gas, and other mining purposes, Osage Mineral Reservation, Okla.;

H. R. 3343. An act to amend the Alaska game law;

H. R. 3376. An act to ratify and confirm act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945;

H. R. 3395. An act to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, California; and

H. R. 3679. An act to enable the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1180. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1260. An act to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934;

H. R. 3051. An act to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780; 34 U. S. C. 495a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503; 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft, known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3127. An act to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 3501. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4017. An act to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1810. An act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other legislation to permit part-time referees in bankruptcy to act as agents or attorneys for claimants against the United States;

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary";

H. R. 3555. An act to amend subsection (b) of section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3690. An act to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; and

H. R. 3958. An act to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents and for taking action in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1938. An act to authorize the contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations of an amount equal to the moneys received by the Selective Service System for the services of persons assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 2225. An act authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort McIntosh at Laredo, Tex., and certain personal property in connection therewith, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 1995. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service; and

H. R. 3638. An act to amend section 10 of the act establishing a National Archives of the United States Government; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 3146. An act to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3219. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3759. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3950. An act to reduce individual income-tax payments; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2956. An act to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 3513. An act to transfer the Panama Railroad pension fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

#### INTERSTATE WATER RIGHTS IN COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM—APPEAL FROM THE DECISION OF THE CHAIR RELATING TO REFERENCE OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the 3d instant, the Senate at this time, in legislative session, will resume the consideration of the appeal by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] from the decision of the Chair referring to the Committee on the Judiciary the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) to authorize commencement of an action by the United States to determine interstate water rights in the Colorado River, under a limitation of debate of 2 hours, one-half of such time to be controlled by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and one-half by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to submit a unanimous-consent request that the time limitation be reduced from 2 hours to 1 hour, and that thereupon the Senate shall vote upon the appeal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With the same time division as previously agreed to?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is no objection on my part to the reduction in the limitation of time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have sent to Senators a memorandum in regard to this matter, but for fear they

have been busy, as I have, and that all Senators have not read it, I should like to read it to the Senate at this time. It is less than a page in length and is as follows:

In announcing his decision the President pro tempore began by stating:

"This is one of those situations in which the color of argument very easily can be made for reference either to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary or to the Senate Committee on Public Lands. The question, therefore, becomes one of where the preponderance of interest would seem to lie."

And in conclusion he said:

"The ruling is open to an appeal, and the Chair certainly will take no offense if an appeal is made, since this is one of those things which ought to be fully liquidated and ventilated, because we are making precedents all the time in the present Congress in respect to a brand-new chapter in the parliamentary life of the Senate."

The appeal from the decision of the Chair is based upon the practical question as to which of the two committees is capable of giving the best advice to the Senate regarding the necessity for the proposed law suit. Paragraph 8 and 9 of section (m) of the Congressional Reorganization Act of August 2, 1946, grant jurisdiction to the Committee on Public Lands over:

"8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for irrigation projects.

"9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes."

When the President pro tempore ruled, he did not know that such a law suit had been proposed in opposition to a bill now under active consideration by the Committee on Public Lands and that the need for it must be decided by that committee. If the joint resolution is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, two Senate committees will be considering the same question at the same time.

Committees are servants of the Senate. It is obvious that, because of its greater knowledge of the inherent problems of water rights, the Committee on Public Lands is best qualified to recommend to the Senate whether or not it is now necessary for the Department of Justice to take the time and trouble and go to the expense of a suit in the Supreme Court to determine the claims and rights of five States to the use of water in the lower Colorado River Basin.

Reference of the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary because it has jurisdiction over "judicial proceedings, civil and criminal generally" would make the procedure more important than the merits of the law suit itself. By such reasoning, granting the Attorney General authority to file such a suit rates higher than the need for it and to that, the Senate should not agree.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I do not know that I shall use the full 5 minutes. I wish to speak in the capacity of chairman of the committee which has had under consideration now for several weeks proposed legislation affecting the division of waters in the area under consideration. In that connection I wish to say that I agree very thoroughly with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona in connection with what he read from Public Law 601 respecting the reference of legislative proposals which are made on the floor of the Senate. Senators who were listening caught the point very definitely. There

is an apparent conflict between the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Public Lands with respect to interstate compacts. Under the heading of matters to be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, interstate compacts generally are very definitely set out. Under the clause sending certain measures to the Committee on Public Lands are listed interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

Normally one might conclude that a measure involving legal questions should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. However, there are many able members of the bar who are not members of the Committee on the Judiciary. Eight of the thirteen members of the Committee on Public Lands are distinguished members of the bar. All of those eight lawyers are familiar with laws affecting the distribution and apportionment of waters in areas where disputes arise. In other words, they are good attorneys on questions relating to irrigation. Therefore I am certain that any legal questions involved could be just as well handled before the Committee on Public Lands as before the Committee on the Judiciary.

In connection with the pending proposal, I wish to submit a further statement with reference to interstate compacts generally. I had an investigation hurriedly made to determine what that phrase might refer to. A short time ago I received a statement from the Library of Congress. It lists a number of acts of Congress authorizing or ratifying agreements between States.

Under the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 932-938), I find a compact between New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut relating to the creation of an interstate sanitation district and commission.

Under the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 939-941), there is a compact between New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, Texas, and other States relative to the conservation of oil and gas.

Under the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1058-1064), there was a compact between Pennsylvania and New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission.

Under the act of April 25, 1936 (49 Stat. 1239, ch. 249), there is a compact between Virginia and other States relating to tobacco control.

Under the act of June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1895, ch. 735, par. 3), I find a compact relating to the negotiation of public park, parkway, and recreational area compacts.

Under the act of July 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 538-542), I find a compact between Maine and New Hampshire for a bridge between the States.

Under the act of August 12, 1937 (50 Stat. 633-637), there is listed a compact between Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and other States, relating to minimum wages.

Under the act of August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 719-723), there is a compact between New York and New Jersey relating to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission.

Under the act of April 5, 1938 (52 Stat. 200, ch. 74), compacts concerning fishing on the Great Lakes were authorized.

Under the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1163, ch. 683), there is a compact between New Jersey and Pennsylvania with respect to the construction, maintenance, and operation of a vehicular tunnel under the Delaware River.

Under the act of August 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 1346, ch. 645), a boundary agreement between Iowa and Missouri was approved.

Under the act of June 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 261, ch. 295), there was a negotiation of compacts for regulation of fishing in the territorial waters and bays of the Atlantic Ocean.

Under the act of August 4, 1942—56 Statutes 736, chapter 545—I find a compact between Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the apportionment of waters of the Republican River. That act was passed since I became a Member of the Senate. The compact to which I refer related to division of waters between Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska in connection with the conservation district which was established. The President did not sign the bill granting consent for the compact. He vetoed it because it was not admitted in the compact that the river was navigable. It is a river which sometimes is perfectly dry. In drafting the compact we did not feel the necessity of admitting the navigability of the river. However, after being returned to the Senate the bill was reenacted under date of May 26, 1943, and in the new bill the navigability of the stream was admitted. That measure was not handled by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, in view of the confusion which might be caused by referring the pending measure to the Committee on the Judiciary, I believe that it should go to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, there is pending before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands Senate bill 1175, which is a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works on the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes. Hearings commenced on the bill on Monday, June 23, and the first phase of the hearings ended on Thursday, July 3, 1947. The committee heard 33 witnesses, and numerous statements were entered in the record. The hearings will be continued when certain official reports and information have been received.

There are two main questions before the committee. The first is, Is Arizona entitled to sufficient water out of the Colorado River system to support the project? The second question is, If Arizona is entitled to enough of such water to support the project, should it be authorized under all the other facts of the case?

Arizona and California are in sharp conflict as to whether Arizona is entitled

to the water out of the Colorado River system necessary to support the project. Eminent engineers and lawyers representing those States have already urged their conflicting views before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands. This is the vital threshold question of the hearing. The committee will have to decide this question. In deciding it, the committee may conclude that the question should be submitted to the courts for a decision; and if it so concludes, it will report accordingly.

The Committee on the Judiciary would have to operate on the basis of the same kind of facts already before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Public Lands Committee.

In a word, the Public Lands Committee, through its Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, through a prior referral to it by the Chair of Senate bill 1175, has acquired jurisdiction of the subject, has proceeded diligently under that jurisdiction, and will pass on the precise question here presented, and will make appropriate recommendations. Therefore there is no justification for referring the same matter to another committee for decision. I therefore urge most respectfully that the appeal from the decision of the Chair be sustained.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have yielded? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that the joint resolution is primarily a measure directing the Attorney General of the United States to file an action in the Supreme Court of the United States against the lower basin States in order to reach a judicial determination. If Senators will examine the joint resolution, they will see that that is the meat of it.

I also invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that in the House of Representatives two identical resolutions were introduced. Both of them have been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. I call attention to the fact that under the Reorganization Act it is provided that legislation relating to judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I call attention to the further fact that it is also provided that interstate compacts generally shall be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I believe the decision of the Chair should be upheld and that the resolution should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, to which it has been properly referred.

The issue here under discussion is whether committee jurisdiction as defined by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 should be enforced in practice or whether, for underlying reasons not clearly disclosed, the act should be made a dead letter. I state it this way because, in my judgment, it is highly im-

portant to carry out the remedial purposes of the act.

Under the old rule XXV, the standing committees of the Senate were named, but there was no specification of the duties assigned to them, other than that which might be inferred from the name of the committee. Of course, during a century and a half of practice under the rule, a body of precedents developed. Where precedents were consistent, the assignment of the duty could be ascertained. Where they were not consistent, which was often the case, decisions were necessarily somewhat the product of the discretion of the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

It was one of the objectives of the Reorganization Act to facilitate the work of the Senate and House by specifying the subjects which the duties of each committee covered. So far as the act is clear and definite in stating these subjects and in avoiding overlapping of subjects, its objective has been reached. It then becomes the duty of the Presiding Officer and of the Senate to abide by the Reorganization Act.

A major purpose of the act is to facilitate the business of the Senate by providing for the orderly and, above all, prompt reference of bills and resolutions to committees. On principle, this purpose of the act is one that should be carried out. Any other course throws the Senate back to the condition of confusion, controversy, and delay, which occurred from time to time before the act.

By section 102 of the act, paragraph 1 (k) of rule XXV assigns to the Committee on the Judiciary as I have already indicated:

1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.

17. Measures relating to claims against the United States.

18. Interstate compacts generally.

The Committee on Public Lands, which has been mentioned by a Senator, has assigned to it under paragraph 1 (m):

8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.

9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

Mr. President, I respectfully call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that in my opinion that would refer to a situation in which the Congress of the United States was authorizing an interstate compact, or in which, if the authorization had been granted, the States came back to have their action ratified. No one would dispute that under such conditions interstate compacts for irrigation purposes should go to the Committee on Public Lands. But such is not the case in regard to the resolution which we have before us.

Looking at the resolution under discussion, it appears from the preamble that controversies exist among the States in the Lower Colorado River Basin as to their rights in the waters of the river and that these controversies relate to the interpretation of the Colorado River Compact, other statutes, contracts, and engineering and economic facts. If this

preamble were the legislation, it might be thought that the subject matter was one for the Committee on Public Lands. But that is not the case.

The legislative part of the resolution directs the Attorney General to commence an action; names the court in which it is to be brought; names the parties who are to be joined and states the subject matter of the action, namely, to require the parties to interplead for the determination of their water rights.

I might say it applies equally to the State represented by my distinguished colleague from Arizona as it does to the State of California which I in part represent. Water is the very life-blood of the Western States.

Thus the primary subject of the legislation, as distinguished from the preamble, is a judicial proceeding, nothing else. The fact that the judicial proceeding is, when brought, to relate to water rights, and incidentally, among a variety of other questions, to the interpretation of an interstate compact, is wholly subordinate and secondary. What the Congress is called on to determine is: Shall there be a lawsuit? This is the field, and as I shall show next, the exclusive field, of the Committee on the Judiciary.

To the Committee on the Judiciary is assigned the field of "Interstate compacts generally." Out of this field is carved a part, "Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes." This one special part of the general field is assigned to the Committee on Public Lands.

There is, however, no similarity between this situation and the subject of "Judicial proceedings." To the Committee on the Judiciary is assigned the field of "Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally." No part of this field is assigned by the Reorganization Act to any other committee. The jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary over judicial proceedings would therefore appear to be exclusive. Any other view would lead to this result: If legislation relating to judicial proceedings is assigned to committees, not because it relates to judicial proceedings, but because the proposed proceeding relates to a particular subject, then all such legislation would be assigned to the committee having jurisdiction of the field of the subject of the proposed action, and the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary is, by this process, regularly and completely whittled away. The intent of the Reorganization Act is, then, set at naught.

The guiding principle which should determine the issue before the Senate is plainly set out in section 137 of the Reorganization Act:

In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of a standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the presiding officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation; but such decision shall be subject to an appeal.

Under that section of the Reorganization Act the Presiding Officer of the

Senate and the Parliamentarian have indicated that this legislation belongs in the Committee on the Judiciary.

In my judgment, this principle requires that legislation, in which the predominating and primary subject matter is a judicial proceeding, should be assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary. In the resolution under consideration, the predominating and primary subject matter is a judicial proceeding. The reference to an interstate compact and to water rights are purely incidental and subordinate to the main issue, which is: Shall a lawsuit be brought?

In my judgment, the Senate will do well to abide by the law which the Congress has enacted. It will definitely do well to facilitate the prompt reference of legislation to committees by adhering to the terms of the law and avoid the somewhat circuitous arguments which this type of debate seems to engender.

I wish to say that I regret very much that this situation has arisen, but it is a fundamental issue, and it is, in my opinion, an irreconcilable issue until it is determined by the courts of the land. It is normal practice, when there is a difference of opinion between individuals that cannot be settled by arbitration, to go to the courts of the land and there have an adjudication or settlement. California is willing to abide by the settlement which the Supreme Court might make in an issue of this kind. In that connection, I want to call attention to a letter which was written by the Governor of California to the Governor of Arizona under date of May 16, 1947, from which I quote, as follows:

I gather from these two letters that you believe it is unnecessary to try to write a compact between the lower basin States or to have our respective claims arbitrated, because you consider the existing statutes, contracts, etc., have so settled the rights of Arizona, California, and Nevada in the Colorado River that there are no substantial differences between the States. It may well be that the suggestions of a compact and arbitration are not feasible at this late date, but I am of the opinion that there are such basic divergences of interpretation of the statutes and documents mentioned above, particularly between Arizona and California, that without an authoritative determination as to which State is right, it is impossible for anyone to know what quantity of water either State is entitled to. If our States are to plan for their futures, they must know with certainty how much water is eventually to be made available to them, because everyone recognizes that there is not enough water in the river to fully serve the legitimate aspirations of both our States.

It seems to me that a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States, to which the lower basin States and the United States are parties, is essential to supply the necessary answer. This would of course require a jurisdictional act of Congress, authorizing the United States to be made a party to such suit. Governor Pittman of Nevada has expressed a similar opinion in a letter to me dated March 6, a copy of which is enclosed. I am sure that such a procedure will eventually redound to the benefit of both of our States.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I merely wish to say that legislation similar to this, introduced in the House of Representatives on two separate occasions, was referred to the House Committee on the

Judiciary. I wish to call attention to the fact that the Reorganization Act itself clearly indicates that matters of this kind should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I also point out that in my opinion the spirit of the Reorganization Act would seem to indicate that similar measures in the two Houses should be referred to like committees in the two Houses.

For the reasons stated, Mr. President, I earnestly urge that the Members of the Senate uphold the decision of the Chair in regard to the reference of the joint resolution to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arizona has about the same amount of time available that I have.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I know of two Senators who are to speak. Does the Senator from Nevada know of one Senator who is to speak?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I know of one.

Mr. HAYDEN. I can yield to my colleague the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. I should like to know who has the most time remaining.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARRAN. And the Senator from Arizona has 18 minutes remaining, as I recall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I can add but little to what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] in regard to the jurisdiction of the joint resolution which has been introduced by the Senators from California and the Senators from Nevada.

The junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has just stated that he bases his claim for jurisdiction of this resolution by the Judiciary Committee upon the fact that the Judiciary Committee is given jurisdiction over judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally. I should like to emphasize the word "generally." Then I should like to refer to subparagraph 18 of the rule giving jurisdiction to that committee, where we find the words "Interstate compacts generally."

I submit that when the authors of the Reorganization Act used the word "generally," it had a meaning; and I submit that it had this meaning—that when legislation touching upon specific topics was referred to another committee having explicit jurisdiction of such specific topics, the Judiciary Committee should not have jurisdiction of that legislation. That is exactly the situation in this particular case.

Mr. President, in the Reorganization Act itself we find the following:

(m) Committee on Public Lands, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.

9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

So, Mr. President, subparagraph 9, which I have just read, coupled with the other provisions which I have already cited, prove that the Congress of the United States intended that the word "generally" should have a meaning, and that a general grant of jurisdiction to one committee would be limited by a specific bestowal of particularized jurisdiction to another committee.

It has been pointed out here that this subject matter is already under consideration by the Public Lands Committee, in connection with its consideration of Senate bill 1175. I wish to call attention to the fact that the joint resolution itself shows that it comes within the jurisdiction of the Public Lands Committee, because in the preamble we find the following statement:

The meaning and effect of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, the California Limitation Act (Stats. Cal. 1929, ch. 16), various contracts executed by the Secretary of the Interior with States, public agencies, and others in the Lower Basin of the Colorado River and other documents and as to various engineering, economic, and other facts.

Mr. President, in view of all those matters, as set forth in subparagraphs 8 and 9 of paragraph (m) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, promulgated in the Reorganization Act, which I have just read, I submit that the specific jurisdiction conferred upon the Public Lands Committee should prevail, and because of the further fact that in this particular instance, as I have previously stated, the jurisdiction of this subject matter has already been conferred upon the Public Lands Committee by the reference to it of Senate bill 1175.

Two weeks of testimony have been taken before the subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee, and in the course of that testimony the necessity for the development of a central project in Arizona, of great importance to our State, has been stressed. It has been pointed out that many people will have to leave their farms and their homes and their businesses if additional water is not secured for central Arizona.

In opposition to that measure, various witnesses from California have stated and alleged that it would be necessary to have litigation before the passage of the bill. The Public Lands Committee will have to decide that question in connection with its determination of what should be done in regard to Senate bill 1175.

Mr. President, I have prepared extracts from the testimony upon behalf of California. I shall not now read all of them into the RECORD, because time will not permit; but I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit A.)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to a statement of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who appeared before our committee and filed a statement in opposition to the enactment of Senate bill 1175. One of the grounds which he stated at that time was that there should be a judicial determination of issues prior to passage of legislation. I quote from the concluding portion of his statement:

To put this matter at rest, the Senators from Nevada and California are joining in introducing a bill to authorize suit. This jurisdictional bill should be speedily considered and passed. Pending its disposition, no action should be taken on any large consumptive-use projects in the lower basin.

In other words, Mr. President, those who oppose the enactment of Senate bill 1175 have made this an issue before the Public Lands Committee, and that issue will have to be decided by that committee. It may well be that the Public Lands Committee will decide that there should be some form of litigation. I regret that because of the parliamentary situation the Chair did not have the benefit of knowing that the issue was pending before that committee at the time when the Chair made the ruling.

But if the committee decides that legislation is necessary, it might further decide that legislation different from that provided by the joint resolution is necessary, and the committee might report its own recommendations for authorizing or requiring litigation. In other words, if the resolution is referred to the Judiciary Committee, we might well have two committees making different decisions upon the same subject. I am sure it was not the intent of the Reorganization Act that two different committees should be considering the same subject matter at the same time.

For that reason, if for no other, Mr. President—namely, that the Committee on Public Lands already has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the joint resolution under consideration, as pointed out by the junior Senator from Colorado—I submit that Joint Resolution 145 should be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### EXHIBIT A

##### EXTRACTS FROM STATEMENTS MADE DURING HEARINGS ON S. 1175 AS TO NECESSITY FOR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION

##### I. WITNESSES UPON BEHALF OF CALIFORNIA

A. Mr. Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., assistant attorney general of California:

1. "It is not possible for any man to predict, with fair certainty, how the Supreme Court would resolve the interdependent and therefore interacting uncertainties of the situation. Yet they should be resolved" (p. 527, vol. 6, typed transcript).

"Without a determination, neither State has a sound foundation upon which to erect its future irrigation development. Nor has the Congress either the jurisdiction to solve the problem nor the equipment with which to solve it" (pp. 527-528, vol. 6, typed transcript).

B. Mr. William S. Peterson, assistant chief electrical engineer, department of water and power, city of Los Angeles, Calif.:

1. (Reading into record a letter from Mr. Samuel B. Morris, general manager and chief engineer of the department above noted.)

"These claims are vigorously disputed by Arizona and must some day be settled by agreement or judicial decision" (p. 723, vol. 8, typed transcript).

2. "I will oppose it until the water features of the dam are settled by any one of the three methods provided for in the compact, that is, interstate agreement, arbitration, or by a Supreme Court decision" (p. 736, vol. 8, typed transcript).

"On the contrary we are only pleading that the controversy be settled before we try to draft things of this nature and make Congress make the decision instead of relying on interstate agreement, arbitration, or the Supreme Court" (p. 738, vol. 8, typed transcript).

##### II. STATEMENT OF SENATOR McCARRAN

"To put this matter at rest, the Senators from Nevada and California are joining in introducing a bill to authorize suit. This jurisdictional bill should be speedily considered and passed. Pending its disposition, no action should be taken on any large consumptive use projects in the lower basin" (note, p. 933, vol. 10, typed transcript).

##### III. STATEMENT OF SENATOR DOWNEY

"But I do not believe any decision by Congress on this matter by which it would authorize a project allocating that amount of water to Arizona would ever become final until the Supreme Court of the United States has spoken on it or until there has been an arbitration" (p. 739, vol. 8, typed transcript).

"Of course, we would continue to object to this bill until the Supreme Court of the United States or arbitration or interstate compact settles this issue between California and Arizona" (p. 772, vol. 9, typed transcript).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the matter pending before the Senate today, shorn of all extraneous considerations, is one that is definitely and emphatically decided by a law in the passage of which the Senate of the United States participated, namely the law known as the Reorganization Act. There is no use talking about water, or reclamation, or a division of water. The only question before the Senate is, will we live up to the law as Congress enacted it? Will we say that when we place jurisdiction of a certain subject matter in the Committee on the Judiciary we will live up to our declaration in that respect?

Mr. President, what is the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary? I read from the Reorganization Act:

(k) Committee on the Judiciary, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subject:

1. Judicial proceedings, civil and criminal, generally.

What is the joint resolution under consideration, a ruling as to the reference of which has been made? The joint resolution provides:

That for the purpose of avoiding a multiplicity of actions and expediting the development of the Colorado River Basin, the Attorney General—

The law arm of the Government—is hereby directed to commence in the Supreme Court of the United States—

The court which has jurisdiction, and the only court which has jurisdiction—against the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah—

Naming the parties defendant—and such other parties as may be necessary or proper to a determination, a suit or action in the nature of interpleader.

There, by the joint resolution, the law arm of the Government is called upon to exercise its proper functions, the parties defendant are named, the nature of the action is fixed.

What committee has any color of jurisdiction to take hold of or try or determine those matters? The whole joint resolution rests upon the language I have read. Everything else is only subordinate to the main and principal object, namely, that the Congress of the United States calls on the law arm of the United States to institute an action, naming the nature of the action, naming the tribunal in which the action must be instituted, and naming the parties defendant. Everything else falls by the wayside, so far as fixing jurisdiction for committee assignment is concerned.

Mr. President, when Congress enacted the law reorganizing the Congress it set up new regulations and new rules for this body. There is no question involved of which side one might favor in this controversy. One of the sides may be more popular than the other. That is not the question. The question is, will we live up to the law which Congress enacted, and assign the joint resolution to the committee to which the Congress provided it should be assigned, when we call by legislation on the law arm of the Government to institute an action, naming the action, naming the forum in which it shall be tried? Shall we assign such a measure to the very committee to which the law said it should be assigned?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am concerned about the decision of the Senate in this matter because it will set a pattern for rulings in similar cases in the future. I do not wish to become involved in any controversy over the interpretation of the law we enacted some years ago for the distribution of the water of the Colorado River, but the thought which has been worrying me about the ruling of the Chair is that if we overrule his decision, and decide that the joint resolution instructing the Attorney General to bring a lawsuit should go to the Committee on Public Lands, because that committee may have originated legislation which needs interpretation, hereafter, if we should order the Attorney General to bring a suit to interpret some phases of the AAA legislation, that would have to go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because out of that committee came the original law. Or, if we should have before us a joint resolution instructing the Attorney General to institute a lawsuit interpreting some law with reference to the War Department, the joint resolution would have to go to the Committee on the Armed Services, instead of to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I am wondering whether, by overruling the Chair in this matter, we would set a precedent whereby the Committee on the

Judiciary could never get jurisdiction of a bill directing the Attorney General and the Department of Justice to institute legal proceedings in the Federal courts to interpret any law. It is the effect of the ruling on our future proceedings that worries me, and not any controversy growing out of the law we enacted some years ago for the distribution of the water of the Colorado River. What is the Senator's reaction to my statement?

Mr. McCARRAN. Apropos of the expression the leader of the minority has made, I would quote from the language of the President pro tempore. He said:

We are making precedents all the time in the present Congress in respect to a brand new chapter in the parliamentary life of the Senate.

In answer to the suggestion brought forward by the Senator from Kentucky, if we overrule the decision of the Chair in this matter, no one will be able to say from now on to what committee a bill may be assigned, notwithstanding the nature of the bill as shown on its face.

Let me say, further, that the question raised by the able leader of the minority is a serious one. It is serious if this body is to be governed by rules and by the law which it, the Senate of the United States, participated in enacting. If it is to be so governed, then the ruling of the Chair will stand. If not, and if we overrule the Chair now, no one will be able to say in the future to what committee any bill may be assigned. We are making precedents, as the President pro tempore stated, and we are making precedents under a law which we ourselves enacted.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator is speaking of precedents, and I am wondering if there is a precedent in the language of the joint resolution which is attached to a statement by the Senator from Arizona. I notice that the Attorney General, who is the law officer of the Government, is directed to commence suit. I do not know whether there are precedents for congressional direction to the law officer of the Government or not, but it strikes me as going far to take from a law officer of the Government the obligation which he may have, and provide that he must be guided by a direction of the Congress of the United States in bringing a suit.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a matter which would properly be considered by the Committee on the Judiciary because it is a part of the sum and substance of the joint resolution, and it would be considered by the committee. The Committee on the Judiciary, being the law committee of the Senate, is the only committee which would properly have jurisdiction of the very question which the Senator from Maine raises.

In conclusion, there is only one issue to be determined here, and that is the question of jurisdiction. Everything else falls by the wayside. Is this a subject matter for the Committee on the Judiciary? If so, then it should go to that committee. Is the Committee on the

Judiciary the law committee of the Senate? If so, it should have jurisdiction of this resolution; because the only thing that the resolution does is to invoke the law arm of the Government and request it to act in a court of competent and proper jurisdiction.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I had yielded to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HATCH. I wanted a little time in my own right.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona yields 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I hope it may be understood so far as I am concerned that there is no challenge to the integrity or the patriotism of any committee of the Senate. That remark is prompted by a question propounded to me by the Senator from Nevada the other day. The simple fact is, and I want Senators to understand it, that this issue has been submitted to the Committee on Public Lands. It was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Nevada himself. He invited and invoked the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Lands. Every lawyer knows that, having once submitted oneself to the jurisdiction of the court and invited that jurisdiction, he invites it to the end. He cannot suddenly change his tactics in the manner that it is now being attempted to be done. What is actually happening, Mr. President, is that the Committee on Public Lands has jurisdiction of the question. It has spent weeks investigating it. The question of whether or not a suit should be filed was submitted to the committee by the Senator from Nevada, and the committee has the whole matter under consideration at the present time. To deprive that committee of its jurisdiction, a resolution is offered, and it is asked that the resolution go to another committee, which has no jurisdiction at all of the problem. Those are the simple facts. The Committee on Public Lands has jurisdiction. It had it in the beginning. Its jurisdiction was invited, it was invoked; and now, at this late hour, it is sought to transfer the jurisdiction to another committee. Mr. President, that simply is not in keeping with any idea I have ever had of either the fundamental, substantive law, or of parliamentary procedure.

The Committee on Public Lands, Mr. President, is amply able to determine the question as to whether or not litigation should be instituted. That committee has primary responsibility for all matters concerning the distribution of waters and projects of that kind.

I am very sure, had the President pro tempore realized that the Committee on Public Lands had already acquired jurisdiction and was considering not only the basic problem but also the question of whether or not it was proper or necessary to institute litigation, he would have ruled contrary to his present ruling. In saying that, I am not criticizing the President pro tempore in any respect.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President may I inquire of the Senator from New Mexico what was submitted to the Committee on Public Lands? Was it a proposal to amend the law?

Mr. HATCH. No. It was a bill involving distribution of the waters of the Colorado River.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand, but was that simply confined to determining whether the courts should pass upon the question?

Mr. HATCH. No. It involved the whole question of the proper distribution of those waters. I may be wrong in that; if I am, I ask the Senators from Arizona to correct me.

Mr. OVERTON. It seems to me, referring to a suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky, that if it were desired to deprive any committee of jurisdiction over a bill, which was vested in the committee, all that would be necessary would be to submit a resolution that the whole matter be referred to a court for decision, and then the Committee on the Judiciary would have to pass upon it.

Mr. HATCH. I would probably agree with the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Any committee could be deprived of jurisdiction of a bill by a simple proposal to refer the matter to a court.

Mr. HATCH. That is exactly what we have now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the consideration that has disturbed me so much about this matter. I looked into the Legislative Reorganization Act, because I happened to be a member of the committee that drafted the bill, and I endeavored to determine whether or not the resolution relates essentially to compacts already in existence, or whether it relates to a lawsuit that may come into existence at a later date. Undoubtedly, legislation affecting compacts should go to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that, because that committee has jurisdiction of the compacts. We already have the compacts; they are in esse; they are in existence at the present time. I know nothing about them, except that I know they are in existence. Any legislation affecting those compacts must go to the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. HATCH. That has been the thought, rather reasonably, I may say.

Mr. RUSSELL. It occurs to me that that would be a device that could be used to deny jurisdiction.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. HATCH. If I may have 1 minute more, I want to agree wholeheartedly with what the Senator has said, because this device could be used to deprive any committee of jurisdiction on any subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. How much of the time remains, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has between 4 and 5 minutes available.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Nevada has how many minutes remaining?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think I have 6 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has 5 or 6 minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest the Senator use his time; then we will consume ours.

Mr. McCARRAN. I want to dwell upon the colloquy between the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from New Mexico, which occurred just a moment ago, in which the Senator from Georgia evidently, through inadvertence, made a misleading remark, because the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary among other things includes the subject of interstate compacts, generally. That subject is within the jurisdiction of the committee, as are judicial proceedings, civil and criminal. I refer now to numbers 1, 17, and 18 of the assignments of jurisdiction to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from Arizona will have an opportunity to answer me. The pending resolution would interfere in no way with the matter that is pending before the Committee on Public Lands. The Committee on Public Lands, within its jurisdiction, may go anywhere it desires, in considering the bill S. 1175.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am well aware of that, and I agree with the Senator; but the difficulty is that the Committee on Public Lands no doubt has jurisdiction over water compacts.

Mr. McCARRAN. They both have jurisdiction, in a way, because I read from the law, "interstate compacts generally"; so the same matter is before the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the act before me, but I looked at it and it specifically delegated to the Public Lands Committee jurisdiction over interstate water compacts.

Mr. McCARRAN. That may be true, but I am reading from the law, from which the Senator also quoted.

I have a minute or so left. I return to this proposition. None of the side issues should be brought in to becloud the real issue. The entire jurisdiction is set out in the act, and it is set out in language so plain that no one can question it.

The resolution provides:

The Attorney General—

That is, the law arm of the Government, which certainly is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary—

is hereby directed to commence in the Supreme Court of the United States of America—

That certainly is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary—against the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah—

The defendants are named, the nature of the action is named, the forum is named. What more is needed to determine jurisdiction, beyond the language

of the resolution itself? Everything else falls by the wayside.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point the statement of the Senator from Nevada before the Committee on Public Lands relative to the bill (S. 1175) pending before that committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAT McCARRAN, OF NEVADA, RE S. 1175, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

The Senate Committee on Public Lands has under consideration S. 1175, a bill to authorize the construction of the central Arizona project.

#### THE PROJECT

The project would consist primarily of the Bridge Canyon Dam on the Colorado River above Boulder Dam, and an aqueduct to transport Colorado River water to central Arizona, through tunnels over 80 miles long, bypassing Boulder Dam. Initially, however, instead of building these tunnels, a branch or alternate aqueduct would be built from Parker Dam, lifting the water by pumping nearly a thousand feet, to join the ultimate Bridge Canyon aqueduct route at a junction point part way to the Phoenix area, and using about a third of the Bridge Canyon power. The remaining two-thirds would be sold. The potential customers are supposed to be in California, Nevada, and Arizona.

#### COST

The ultimate project will cost over \$1,000,000,000. The initial part of it, involving the Parker pumping route, will cost over \$600,000,000. This latter figure is about the same as the estimated cost of the St. Lawrence seaway, and five times the cost of the Boulder Canyon project.

#### FINANCING PLAN

Under the plan set up by the bill, no part of the capital cost will be repaid by the Arizona irrigators. Either the Federal Treasury, or the power users, are expected to pay for all of it. The water will be sold to the irrigators at \$4.50 per acre-foot, which, according to the Reclamation Bureau, is less than the cost of operation and maintenance alone.

#### SUBSIDIES REQUIRED

The power users or the Federal taxpayers will have to provide not only the six hundred million to one billion of capital costs, but also over \$3,000,000 per year in operating expense.

The scheme does not contemplate that the Treasury will get any interest on its power investment. The amortization period is estimated at over 80 years. The lost interest alone, for 80 years at 2 percent, is over a billion dollars, even if the capital is recovered; and during the same period the Federal taxpayers or the power users would have to carry the burden of over a quarter billion dollars of operating expense that the water users cannot pay.

#### IMPORTANCE OF POWER TO NEVADA

Abundant cheap power is essential to Nevada. Bridge Canyon power site, properly developed, can be an asset to Nevada and the other intermountain areas within transmission distance. But as proposed in this bill, a million and a quarter acre-feet would ultimately bypass Boulder and Davis Dams, reducing the power Nevada is entitled to at such projects. More important, Bridge Canyon power itself would be loaded with over \$300,000,000 of subsidy to an Arizona irrigation project. When the Boulder Canyon Project Act was debated, Nevada insisted that

power at Boulder Dam should not have to pay for any part of the All-American Canal. The power users of Nevada are entitled to have the same principle apply to Bridge Canyon.

#### RELATION TO NATIONAL DEBT

Coming on the heels of an effort to reduce Federal income taxes four billions, and to reduce the current budget by a comparable figure, any project that adds over a billion to the interest burden on the taxpayer deserves mature consideration.

#### EFFORTS AT HASTE

The bill has not been reported upon by the Interior Department. The Reclamation Bureau has not completed its investigations and hence is not yet ready to submit its proposed plans to the seven affected States for their comment, as is required by the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendments to the Flood Control Act of 1944; furthermore, it will not be ready to do so for another year. The procedure used here would make a dead letter of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendments. The project has not cleared the Bureau of the Budget. The Boulder Canyon Project Act involved only a fifth as much money, but Arizona opposed it and kept it before Congress for many years. In spite of all this, the project's sponsors are pressing the Arizona delegation to get it reported out and passed. The Congress is being deluged with publicity and propaganda in its favor.

#### WATER

The enormous investment proposed in S. 1175 is a gamble on an uncertain water supply. As the direct result of the Mexican Water Treaty, which was opposed by two of the three lower basin States, and by most of the water users in Arizona, but which was supported by the sponsors of S. 1175, the lower basin is confronted with a catastrophic water shortage. Commissioner Bashore furnished the Senate, at my request, figures published in Senate Document 39, Seventy-ninth Congress, showing that the face amount of the Government's commitments in the low basin would exceed the supply available in a dry decade like 1931-40, after the upper basin is fully developed, by well over 2,000,000 acre-feet per year, and that even after drawing down Boulder Dam storage 1,500,000 acre-feet a year, there would be a deficit of over three-quarters of a million acre-feet annually. In the hearings on S. 1175, Arizona's expert, Mr. Debler, has admitted that Boulder cannot safely be drawn down more than 900,000 acre-feet per year, and that in order to make good on the Mexican treaty, the upper basin must be called upon to increase its deliveries at Lee Ferry and reduce its own uses for periods as long as 20 years at a time.

#### NECESSITY FOR ADJUDICATION

Obviously, the Government should not risk a billion dollars nor any part of it on a project dependent on an uncertain water supply. This project's supply is uncertain. It has a supply, at all, only if the Colorado River compact is construed as Arizona wants it construed. Nevada and California are not in agreement with Arizona's interpretations. Governor Warren, of California, and Governor Pittman, of Nevada, have offered to Governor Osborn, of Arizona, to either negotiate, arbitrate, or join in obtaining authorization by Congress for a suit in the Supreme Court. The permission of Congress is necessary to the latter course, because the United States is a necessary party. Arizona has replied, refusing to negotiate, or arbitrate, or litigate. She wants a political settlement in Congress. The water rights involved here are States' rights, not subject to disposition by Congress.

To put this matter at rest, the Senators from Nevada and California are joining in introducing a bill to authorize suit. This jurisdictional bill should be speedily considered and passed. Pending its disposition,

no action should be taken on any large consumptive-use projects in the lower basin.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to read the provisions of the act to which I referred yesterday, at which time the act was not before me. Under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Lands, there is specifically spelled out in subparagraph 8 the following:

Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.

Subparagraph 9 reads as follows:

Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.

What is the basis of this resolution? Is it the lawsuit or the compacts? It would be impossible to have a lawsuit without the compacts, and the Public Lands Committee had jurisdiction of the compacts. That committee should not be denied jurisdiction by submitting a resolution authorizing a lawsuit.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Arizona is agreeable, I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I respectfully suggest that Arizona has not approved the compact.

Mr. HAYDEN. Since when?

Mr. McCARRAN. Since when did Arizona join the compact?

Mr. HAYDEN. The compact has been ratified by the Legislature of the State of Arizona and approved by our Governor, so Arizona is completely a member of the compact.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may be in error in that statement. If so, I retract it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Nevada is in error.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That time is under my control, is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; that time remains to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I invite the attention of the Senate to the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] on behalf of himself and three of his colleagues in which he specifically refers to the meaning and effect of the Colorado River compact. The act authorizing that compact was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, which was the predecessor of the Public Lands Committee. The joint resolution refers to the Boulder Canyon Project Act, which was also reported out of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. The Public Lands Committee is now the successor of that committee and has all the jurisdiction over the same subject matter. Every one of the acts set forth in the joint resolution came out of committees whose jurisdiction has been transferred to the Senate Committee on

Public Lands, and that committee is competent to determine whether or not there should be a lawsuit in regard to the compact and all the acts of Congress cited in the joint resolution. For that reason I am convinced that the Chair was in error. That is the reason why I have made the appeal, and I ask the Senate, when the matter is submitted, to vote not to sustain the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|          |                 |                |
|----------|-----------------|----------------|
| Alken    | Hayden          | Morse          |
| Baldwin  | Hickenlooper    | Murray         |
| Ball     | Hill            | O'Mahoney      |
| Barkley  | Hoey            | Overton        |
| Brewster | Holland         | Pepper         |
| Bricker  | Jenner          | Reed           |
| Brooks   | Johnson, Colo.  | Revercomb      |
| Buck     | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson, Va. |
| Butler   | Kem             | Russell        |
| Cain     | Kilgore         | Saltonstall    |
| Capper   | Knowland        | Smith          |
| Chavez   | Langer          | Sparkman       |
| Connally | Lodge           | Stewart        |
| Cooper   | Lucas           | Taft           |
| Cordon   | McCarran        | Taylor         |
| Donnell  | McCarthy        | Thomas, Okla.  |
| Dworshak | McClellan       | Thye           |
| Eaton    | McFarland       | Umstead        |
| Ellender | McGrath         | Vandenberg     |
| Ferguson | McKellar        | Watkins        |
| Flanders | McMahon         | Wherry         |
| George   | Magnuson        | White          |
| Green    | Malone          | Wiley          |
| Gurney   | Martin          | Williams       |
| Hatch    | Millikin        | Young          |
| Hawkes   | Moore           |                |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Chair has said that the question is whether or not the decision of the Chair shall stand as the judgment of the Senate. A vote "yea," as I understand, will mean that the pending joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and a vote "nay" is a vote to retain the jurisdiction of the joint resolution in the Committee on Public Lands?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is only partially correct. A vote "yea" sustains the decision of the Chair, and the joint resolution will go to the Committee on the Judiciary. A vote "nay" overrules the Chair's decision to send the joint resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary, but leaves the Chair entirely free and independent to send it wherever he pleases, at which point, however, for the information of the Senate, the Chair will, under such circumstances, refer the joint resolution to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assumed that that would be the action taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when his name was called) voted "present."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his immediate family.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. The Senator from Indiana, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from California, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is unavoidably detained, the airplane on which he was to return to Washington today having been grounded because of weather conditions.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is necessarily absent. If the Senator from California were present he would vote "yea," and if the Senator from Indiana were present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 41, as follows:

## YEAS—35

|         |              |          |
|---------|--------------|----------|
| Baldwin | Cooper       | Kem      |
| Ball    | Cordon       | Knowland |
| Barkley | Donnell      | Lodge    |
| Bricker | Dworshak     | McCarran |
| Brooks  | Ferguson     | McCarthy |
| Buck    | Hawkes       | McKellar |
| Cain    | Hickenlooper | Malone   |
| Capper  | Hill         | Martin   |

Moore  
Pepper  
Revercomb  
Saltonstall

Smith  
Taft  
Thye  
Wherry

White  
Wiley  
Williams

## NAYS—41

Alken  
Brewster  
Butler  
Chavez  
Connally  
Eaton  
Ellender  
Flanders  
George  
Green  
Gurney  
Hatch  
Hayden  
Hoey

Holland  
Jenner  
Johnson, Colo.  
Johnston, S. C.  
Kilgore  
Langer  
Lucas  
McClellan  
McFarland  
McGrath  
McMahon  
Magnuson  
Millikin  
Morse

Murray  
O'Mahoney  
Overton  
Reed  
Robertson, Va.  
Russell  
Sparkman  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Thomas, Okla.  
Umstead  
Watkins  
Young

## VOTING PRESENT—1

Vandenberg

## NOT VOTING—18

Bridges  
Bushfield  
Byrd  
Capehart  
Downey  
Eastland

Fulbright  
Ives  
Maybank  
Myers  
O'Connor  
O'Daniel

Robertson, Wyo.  
Thomas, Utah  
Tobey  
Tydings  
Wagner  
Wilson

So the decision of the Chair was not sustained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In view of the vote just announced, the Chair now refers the joint resolution to the Committee on Public Lands.

## FINAL REPORT OF UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER TO PHILIPPINE ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 389)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 8435.)

## REPORT OF JOINT PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN FINANCE COMMISSION, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, July 8, 1947.

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,  
President of the Senate pro tempore,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am presenting herewith the Report and Recommendations of the Joint Philippine-American Finance Commission, dated June 7, 1947, and a technical memorandum entitled "Philippine Economic Development" which was prepared for the use of the Joint Commission. I also enclose the letter of the Chairman of the National Advisory Council transmitting this report to me.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

## COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Finance be permitted to hold hearings tomorrow and remain in session during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate tomorrow, Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

## SALE BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES TO FOREIGN PURCHASERS OF GRAIN FOR EXPORT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the bill which I am introducing, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the debate which occurred a few days ago on Senate bill 1465, covering pages 8195 to 8202 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at which time I brought out as best I could the point that a Government agency was assuming a business which should be returned to private enterprise. I am introducing a bill covering that subject alone. I wish to quote what the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House said in reporting on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill, when it had under consideration the new USCC.

The committee, in making its report on the United States Commercial Company, had this to say:

The committee is strongly of the opinion that USCC should not engage in international trade operations whenever and wherever it is practicable to return these operations to private channels.

Again, in the report on Senate bill 1461, which was voted on last Thursday, I want to quote the words of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], as follows:

It is the opinion of the committee that the procurement of wheat should be returned to trade at the earliest moment. It is to be noted that Capt. Granville Conway, Coordinator, Emergency Export Programs, and president, Cosmopolitan Shipping Co., testified that it was his opinion that the trade could assume this responsibility and could exercise it more efficiently than the Government.

Mr. President, I am introducing this bill in order that Members of the Senate may have an opportunity to go into a little further detail and study the question which was before us for decision several days ago.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1586) to prohibit the sale of grain and grain products by Government agencies to foreign purchasers for export, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAIN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(s) The word 'resident' means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than seven months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. In the case of any resident who is an elective or appointive officer or an employee of the Government of the United States, and who is domiciled outside the District during the whole of the taxable year, there shall be excluded from the gross income of such resident salaries or wages received from the Government of the United States for services rendered as such officer or employee, and income derived from sources without the District. For the purposes of this Act the domicile of such officer or employee for any taxable year shall be in the State which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile: *Provided*, That he shall have had a domicile in such State under the laws of such State immediately prior to the beginning of the taxable year for which the tax is claimed. Such declaration must be made in writing, under oath, to the Assessor and the time for filing such declaration shall expire sixty days after written demand to file an income-tax return shall have been received by such officer or employee. As used in this subsection the term 'State' means the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and the term 'Government of the United States' includes any agency or instrumentality thereof, but does not include the Government of the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

HARRY P. CAIN,  
RALPH E. FLANDERS  
(Per H. C.),  
J. HOWARD McGRATH  
(Per H. C.),

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,  
GEORGE J. BATES,  
JOS. P. O'HARA,  
JNO. L. McMILLAN,  
HOWARD W. SMITH,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 58), which was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in section 2 of article III, to insert after the word "repealed" the following: ", effective on the first day of the first month following the approval of this act."*

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

**SALE OF PROPERTY OCCUPIED BY WEATHER BUREAU AT EAST LANSING, MICH.**

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 640) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain property occupied by the Weather Bureau at East Lansing, Mich., and to obtain other quar-

ters for the said Bureau in the State of Michigan, which was, on page 2, to strike out lines 10 to 13, inclusive.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, Senate bill 640 passed the Senate some time ago. The amendment of the House I think is satisfactory to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who was especially interested in the legislation when it was before the Senate; and with his complete approval I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Abbot Low Moffat, of New York, and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Frank Cramer, National Guard of the United States, Army of the United States, to be Chief of the National Guard Bureau, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, under the provisions of law, vice Maj. Gen. Butler Buchanan Miltonberger, to be retired;

Ralph H. Blaylock and Michael M. Spark, to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps; Amedee J. Beaudoin and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Navy; and

David M. Arter and sundry other members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and civilian college graduates, to be ensigns in the Navy.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the remaining nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS—NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank B. Potter, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not expect to object to the nomination just read and the one which follows it on the calendar, but I do not desire to have them considered tonight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be passed over.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Bruce to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the nomination go over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is an important post. It awaits the confirmation of Mr. Bruce's nomination. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not insist upon his request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination having been passed over once, the Chair will state that it cannot go over again except by unanimous consent or on motion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Kentucky in the hope that the Senator from North Dakota will not insist upon this nomination going over. The nomination was before the Committee on Foreign Relations. The nominee was heard, as I understand, by the full committee, and I believe there was a unanimous report from the committee in behalf of the nominee. I join my appeal with that of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGER. It will be perfectly agreeable to take it up tomorrow. There will not be much delay.

Mr. BARKLEY. The question arises, in view of the pending legislation on the calendar for the rest of this week, whether tomorrow or any other day this week there will be time for an executive session. If the Senator only wants to make a speech about this appointee, which I understand is what he wants to do, and not really to oppose his confirmation—

Mr. LANGER. I am the only one voting against him, and I want to make a speech. I should like to do it tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the unfinished business for tomorrow?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business is Senate bill 758, the armed services unification bill.

At the present moment, the parliamentary situation is that inasmuch as the nomination has once been passed over, it cannot be passed over again except upon unanimous consent or on motion.

Is there objection to having the nomination passed over again?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not like to have it passed over, and I do not like to agree to have it passed over. But I do not like to have the Senate detained this afternoon for any great length of time, if we can agree to have the nomination taken up tomorrow.

Let me inquire how long the Senator from North Dakota thinks he will take?

Mr. LANGER. About an hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a great deal of time at this stage of the session of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to having the nomination passed over again?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall not object to having it go over, with the understanding that we have an

executive session tomorrow and that this nomination be taken up.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that if the unification bill is displaced for 1 hour tomorrow, that may necessitate having it go over for another day, whereas we might have a chance to complete action on that bill tomorrow if we have the full day available for it.

Therefore I do not wish to agree to have the nomination take 1 hour from the time otherwise available tomorrow for the unification bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to allow for that hour, why could not the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Mr. GURNEY. I think many committee meetings are scheduled for tomorrow, and we are trying to get them out of the way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair again puts to the Senate the question: Is there objection to passing over the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is passed over.

The clerk will proceed to state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

#### UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Marvin Jones, of Texas, to be Chief Justice of the United States Court of Claims.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. John Caskie Collet, of Missouri, to be judge for the Eighth Circuit, United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the status of the motions which the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] filed a number of weeks ago, to discharge the Civil Service Committee from the further consideration of a number of postmaster nominations?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motions to which the Senator from Illinois refers are on the calendar, although not printed as such, and they have not been called simply because the Senate has never formally gone into executive session since the motions have been filed.

Mr. LUCAS. What are we in now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair states that the Senate has never formally gone into executive session, under the full call of the calendar, since the motions have been filed.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are in executive session now, are we not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is now in executive session; and the Senator from Illinois can call up his motions, if he desires to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to save time, let me say, in regard

to those motions, that the Civil Service Committee has been reporting postmaster nominations practically daily, and I do not think the motions would have any practical effect if they were adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me inquire how many postmaster nominations have been reported.

Mr. LANGER. Approximately 260. Mr. LUCAS. In other words, approximately 260 out of nearly 900?

Mr. BARKLEY. That still leaves approximately 700 to be reported.

Mr. LANGER. We are reporting them as fast as we can obtain reports on them from the Civil Service Commission. We reported 60 today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that quite a number of them were reported today.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will bear with us, we shall report the postmaster nominations, and there will be no necessity to put into effect the motions made by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maryland. Incidentally, let me say that I am in sympathy with those motions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am very happy to obtain that assurance from the Senator from New Mexico. With that understanding, I shall not press the motions today.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also give the same assurance to the Senator from Illinois. We have been reporting the nominations as fast as we can receive reports on them from the Civil Service Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will resume stating the nominations on the calendar.

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lewis V. Evans III to be lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Earl Wells, Jr., of South Dakota to be Cooperative Bank Commissioner of the Farm Credit Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Albert G. Noble, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a week or so ago the Senate confirmed certain

Army nominations en bloc. I call attention to the fact that there are appointments in the Army Nurse Corps, and they might not be included in the original en bloc order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By reference to the statement of the Senator from South Dakota, they are included.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David Chavez, Jr., of New Mexico, to be United States district judge for the district of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry Otis Camp to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

#### RECESS

Mr. WHITE. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 9, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 8 (legislative day of July 7), 1947:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Julian F. Harrington, of Massachusetts, for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, from Foreign Service officer of class 1 to Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister.

##### UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Carl J. Werner, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois. (Mr. Werner is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 18, 1947.)

##### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

##### ALABAMA

Kathleen E. Rollo, Bremen, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

## ALASKA

B. Jean Jensen, Craig, Alaska, in place of Beatrice Starkweather, resigned.  
Lena G. Alderson, Flat, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Orrin S. Felmley, McGrath, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Martha Monsen, Naknek, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
John J. Heuelsen, Pelican, Alaska. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## ARIZONA

Don S. LeBaron, Whiteriver, Ariz., in place of J. I. McEwen, declined.

## CALIFORNIA

Amelia B. Clifton, Altaville, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Phillip L. Anthony, Applegate, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Esther J. Ewoldsen, Big Sur, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Mary Ferrari, Blairsden, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Ruth H. Branson, Branscomb, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
William P. Athearn, Clements, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Albert A. Cedros, Gazelle, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Lola C. Bedoy, Irwindale, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Sybil M. Summers, Mammoth Lakes, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Helen B. Bayne, Nice, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Charles C. Kirk, Piercy, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Arthur R. Martin, Pinecrest, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Pearl M. Davenport, Rosewood, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Martha Waldron, Seeley, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
John P. MacPherson, Trona, Calif., in place of M. J. Kavanagh, resigned.  
Raymond W. Eproson, Twain Harte, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## CONNECTICUT

Robert H. Bossen, South Windsor, Conn., in place of P. E. Bossen, retired.

## FLORIDA

Reid A. Williams, Cassadaga, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Florence H. Porter, Hypoluxo, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Martha R. Brush, Interlachen, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Agnes G. Jones, Mandarin, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Rena F. Harman, Oldsmar, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Francis Sadler, St. Leo, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Floie Torbert, Sorrento, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Naomi E. Clyatt, Terra Ceta, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## HAWAII

Chiyoiki Tanaka, Kapoho, T. E. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1947.  
Celestine T. Aguiar, Ninole, T. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## IDAHO

Marie C. Van Stone, Hope, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Nettie M. Wade, Irwin, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## ILLINOIS

Eugene Elliott, Lake Zurich, Ill., in place of H. L. Lohman, resigned.

## INDIANA

Henry T. Cain, Remington, Ind., in place of H. T. Cain, transferred.

## KENTUCKY

Sister Mary Sophronia Soller, Nerinx, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Sister Margaret E. Walsh, St. Catharine, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## LOUISIANA

McEnry Jones, Baskin, La., in place of H. R. Mock, transferred.  
Elbert Matthews, Cullen, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

## MAINE

James E. Herrick, Bailey Island, Maine, in place of A. G. Sabine, resigned.

## MARYLAND

Shirley I. Bawden, Gibson Island, Md. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1947.  
Golda S. Himburg, Mayo, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Myrtle S. Nickerson, Cotuit, Mass., in place of Isabelle Crocker, deceased.  
Dominic J. Kenney, West Medway, Mass., in place of H. L. Lyons, deceased.

## MICHIGAN

Lionel R. Haight, Mount Pleasant, Mich., in place of A. S. Warner, resigned.

## MINNESOTA

Alfred C. Howe, Aitkin, Minn., in place of C. C. Young, deceased.

## MONTANA

Philetus C. Lapham, Malta, Mont., in place of M. D. Laramy, removed.

## NEBRASKA

Mary L. Wunderlich, Martell, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

## NEVADA

Wilberta G. Silveira, Searchlight, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Carolyn W. Parshall, Stewart, Nev., in place of D. E. Larson, transferred.  
Alice I. Strieby, Wellington, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Percy M. Thurston, Elkins, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Lawrence W. Marden, Holderness, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Mary B. Hallinan, Newfields, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Constance M. McCauley, Twin Mountain, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## NEW JERSEY

Luther Headley, Green Village, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Hanna C. Cochran, Jobstown, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Alvin E. Mott, Vernon, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## NEW MEXICO

Medardo A. Herrera, Ojo Caliente, N. Mex., in place of E. L. Galvez, resigned.

## NEW YORK

Alice M. Maloney, Ausable Chasm, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Evelyn B. Dailey, Prospect, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
William G. Britton, Rensselaerville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Julia E. Ernst, Schuylerville, N. Y., in place of D. J. Falvey, deceased.  
Catherine G. Rieger, Shenorock, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
David L. Hoy, Sidney Center, N. Y., in place of J. H. Ashley, resigned.  
Margaret Zimmons, Somers, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Constant L. Proskine, South Kortright, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Jennie M. James, Tomkins Cove, N. Y., in place of A. V. D. Laskoski, resigned.  
Raymond F. Pafunda, Voorheesville, N. Y., in place of Joseph Hilton, resigned.  
Henry W. Haynes, Whiteface, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## NORTH CAROLINA

DeWitt T. Freeman, Bat Cave, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## OHIO

Harry F. Schiewetz, Dayton, Ohio, in place of C. N. Greer, deceased.

## OREGON

Mabel W. Moore, Detroit, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Sheldon E. Hyde, Island City, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Edna B. McLean, Kerby, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Willis Brewster, McKenzie Bridge, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Arthur M. Hyatt, Maplewood, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Jack Ryland, Mehama, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Edward J. Lumijarvi, Quincy, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Margaret Ray Helmken, Sixes, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Mary J. Krohn, Andalusia, Pa., in place of H. R. Tomlinson, resigned.  
Louis Joseph DePaul, Mount Pocono, Pa., in place of W. S. Mervine, resigned.  
Abram Miller Kurtz, Scotland, Pa., in place of A. M. Kurtz, resigned.  
Charles W. Hess, Three Springs, Pa., in place of J. L. Gracey, resigned.  
Lee E. Roeder, Zionsville, Pa., in place of E. P. Yeakel, retired.

## PUERTO RICO

Julia Morales Maldonado, Castaner, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Huldah M. Murphy, Puerto Real, P. R., Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Wenzel G. Huebl, White Lake, S. Dak., in place of H. L. Kieffer, transferred.

## TEXAS

George M. Patrick, Kinwood, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
George R. Jones, Roanoke, Tex., in place of I. L. Cowan, retired.  
Jack K. Wisener, Wells, Tex., in place of J. R. Oliver, retired.

## UTAH

Elsie L. Price, Junction, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## WASHINGTON

Verl E. Barnes, Dixie, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Esther L. Coleman, Harper, Wash. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1947.  
Lewis E. Willey, Thornton, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## WYOMING

Fred V. Skinner, Big Horn, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Ruth A. Davis, Deaver, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.  
Charlie E. Fesler, Moran, Wyo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 8 (legislative day of July 7), 1947:

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

## UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Hon. Marvin Jones to be Chief Justice of the United States Court of Claims.

## UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. John Caskie Collet to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Lewis V. Evans III to be lieutenant (junior grade), from May 1, 1947.

## FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

James Earl Wells, Jr., to be Cooperative Bank Commissioner of the Farm Credit Administration.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Albert G. Noble, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

## IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

## To Adjutant General's Department

Lt. Col. Cranford Coleman Bryan Warden  
Maj. Robert Loomis Anderson  
Maj. Thomas Edward Pickett Barbour

## To Ordnance Department

Maj. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr.

## To Air Corps

Lt. Col. Gilbert Hayden  
Maj. George Harold Graham  
Maj. Harold Elworthy Todd  
Capt. Henry James Heuer  
Capt. Robert Muirhead Reed  
First Lt. Earl Morse Bradford  
First Lt. William Kneidler Cummins  
First Lt. Frederick Charles Engelmann  
First Lt. Edgar Max McGinnis  
First Lt. Edward Blaklee Reed  
First Lt. Milton Frederick Ritterbush  
First Lt. Joe Neal Swanger  
First Lt. Robert Andrew Wys

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

## To be lieutenant colonels

Florence A. Blanchfield, N700065  
Jessie M. Braden, N701002  
Ida W. Danielson, N700407  
Mary F. Galli, N700648  
Alida J. Garrison, N700329  
Ida L. Langenheder, N700206  
Elizabeth V. Messner, N700047  
Joanna Peters, N700301  
Agnes A. Resch, N700472  
Elsie E. Schneider, N700682  
Burdette B. Sherer, N700669  
Lillian G. Thompson, N701135  
Maidie E. Tilley, N700303  
Edna D. Umbach, N700342  
Rozone Wentz, N700215

## To be majors

Lucile B. Bacchieri, N701701  
Bernice W. Chambers, N700403  
Rosalie D. Colhoun, N702183  
Helen A. Dugan, N700305  
Pearl T. Ellis, N700355  
Elizabeth Fitch, N702129  
Anna M. Grassmyer, N700594  
Abigail B. Graves, N700255  
Frances C. Henchey, N700443  
Helen V. Johnson, N701800  
Pauline Kirby, N701952  
Dorothy M. Kurtz, N701884  
Mary Miller, N700260  
Mary J. Miller, N701895  
Dora A. Noble, N700773  
Amy R. Pendergraft, N702158  
Mary C. Scherer, N700530  
Sara M. Schoenberger, N700722  
Augusta L. Short, N701837  
Alice C. Wickward, N701883

## To be captains

Helen Adams, N702002  
Vivian L. Allmendinger, N702210  
Eleanor R. Asleson, N702583  
Mary S. Barry, N702357  
Estella Baylor, N702187  
Jaynie E. Belcher, N702279  
Monta R. Boswell, N702447  
Althea V. Buckins, N702574  
Burnett C. Drumm, N702479  
Blanche H. Eager, N700173  
Martha Fulwood, N702185  
Mabel E. Hause, N702159  
Myrtle C. Huhner, N701321  
Cecilia F. Kehoe, N701448

Virginia K. Kilroy, N701155  
Ethel A. Lamansky, N701948  
Blenda M. Laverick, N702644  
Margaret M. Moss, N702488  
Julia I. Mullen, N700906  
Clemmie L. Reynolds, N702106  
Alvine L. Schmidt, N700782  
Catherine M. Underdown, N700292  
Lena Vanderwood, N702465

## To be first lieutenants

Irene C. Blochberger, N702966  
Aller M. Crowell, N703093  
Thelma Crowell, N703092  
Anna M. Hackett, N703076  
Emilie K. Jensen, N703013  
Marguerite M. Klein, N703004  
Blanche M. McAndrews, N703063  
Avis O. Meeks, N703034  
Mollie A. Petersen, N703086  
Helen A. Stack, N703024  
Mary M. Steppan, N703082  
Ruth M. Stoltz, N702918  
Frances P. Thorp, N703047  
Madeline M. Ullom, N703031  
Marguerite A. Yerger, N703035

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

## To be brigadier generals

Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr.  
Ralph Gates Boyd  
Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr.  
George Harris Cosby, Jr.  
James Bell Cress  
James Alexander Crothers  
Lloyd William Elliott  
John David Higgins  
Russell Archibald Ramsey

## IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE CORPS, GRADES, AND RANKS INDICATED, IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY

(NOTE.—\*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment.)

## To be lieutenants (junior grade)

\*Stearns, George F., Jr.

## To be ensigns

\*Barahal, George D. \*O'Malley, George F.  
\*Burnett, Collins W. \*Potter, James A., 3d  
\*Fisher, Guin M. Stansell, Herman J., Jr.  
Graham, Horace E. Jr.  
Hartley, Cecil M. \*Thornton, William H., Jr.  
Hedges, William D. \*Vranicar, Raymond  
\*Kenner, Jack L. N.  
\*Maloney, John M. N.  
McKenzie, Lawrence H. Ward, John F.  
Nutter, Paul "M" Willett, Charles F.

To be assistant surgeons, Medical Corps, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Basilicato, Gennaro Mayer, William E.  
Faaland, Halvdan G. K. Orr, William S.  
King, Robert L. Quilter, Thomas N.

To be assistant paymasters, Supply Corps, with the rank of ensign

Batterson, Robert E. Depew, Robert W.  
Davis, Albert S. Desanto, James V.  
Ferris, Robert H. Forlenza, Vincent A.  
Fink, William W. Fowler, George O.  
Shepard, John C. Moon, Ralph E.  
Tucker, Oscar G. Oller, William M.  
Becker, Charles Rehberg, Jerome A.  
Chance, Carl Shenk, Eugene M.  
Cherryman, Rexford R. Woody, Ellis A.

To be assistant civil engineers, Civil Engineer Corps, with the rank of ensign

Kwinn, Edward S.  
Lee, James J.

To be assistant dental surgeons, Dental Corps, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Grossman, Frank D. Rupp, Nelson W.  
McCrory, John J. Staples, William R.

To be commissioned warrant officer, chief radio electrician

Holt, Robert L.

To be commissioned warrant officer, chief pay clerk

Day, Donald J. Kroger, Raymond M.  
Harter, August J. McKenney, Charles V.  
Hiatt, Donald A.

To be ensigns in the Navy from June 6, 1947

Bernard N. Bloom Charles R. Hannum  
Billy A. Dodge Donald J. Weintraut  
Maurice A. Person George T. Younggren  
Donald R. Williams

To be assistant civil engineer in the Navy with the rank of ensign from June 6, 1947

Joseph W. Neudecker, Jr.

To be assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign

Francis Roche

## IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants from June 6, 1947

John W. Drury John D. Krohn  
George C. Fox Eugene R. Puckett  
Jack E. Harlan

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

David Chavez, Jr., to be United States district judge for the district of Puerto Rico.

## UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Henry Otis Camp to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.  
Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Paul V. Galloway, LL. D., pastor of the Central Methodist Church, Fayetteville, Ark., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose presence we gain strength and righteousness, help us to draw near unto Thee that this day may be lived in doing Thy will and in hallowing Thy name.

Bless these men and women as they think and work together. Be with those whom they love and those for whom they labor.

If there are heavy hearts, help them to share with Thee that their burdens may be lessened. If there are crosses to be borne, give them Thy power. If there are motives that are impure and hearts that are unclean, let Thy forgiving love cleanse and purify.

Grant unto all the servants and leaders of our Nation Thy goodness, Thy wisdom, and Thy courage.

Make us receptive to Thy truth that we may walk in Thy paths and be led by Thy light—for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in

which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe; and

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 395. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle.

#### FEDERAL RESERVE BRANCH BANK BUILDINGS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 274, Rept. No. 803), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3952) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### TERMINATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROLS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 275, Rept. No. 804), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) terminating consumer credit controls. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the

Maritime Commission, together with certain accompanying tables.

Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short address by Mr. Ivan Allen, chairman of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Warm Springs Memorial Commission.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram and a letter.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address which I made in the House on January 15, 1926, in opposition to canceling the Italian loan. I think it is very much in order at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 389)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by section 7 (4) of the act of Congress approved March 24, 1934, entitled "An act to provide for the complete independence of the Philippine Islands, to provide for the adoption of a constitution and a form of government for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the seventh and final report of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands covering the period from September 14, 1945, to July 4, 1946.

I recommend that this report be printed as a congressional document.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 8, 1947.

#### PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. GROSS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed by a vote of 388 to 0 the bill to permit cashing of terminal-leave bonds by our veterans. I was in my district on business and could not return in time to be present for the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted for passage of the bill.

#### REDUCING INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 272 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 3950) to reduce individual income tax payments, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to the said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

|              |                 |              |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Barden       | Dorn            | Meade, Ky.   |
| Bland        | Flannagan       | Nixon        |
| Bolton       | Fletcher        | Pace         |
| Boykin       | Fuller          | Powell       |
| Cole, Mo.    | Gifford         | Robison      |
| Cole, N. Y.  | Hart            | Scoblick     |
| Coudert      | Hartley         | Short        |
| Courtney     | Hendricks       | Smith, Ohio  |
| Cravens      | Johnson, Okla.  | Taylor       |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kearns          | Thomas, Tex. |
| Dawson, Ill. | Kelley          | Vinson       |
| Dingell      | Lanham          | Vorys        |
| Domengeaux   | Mansfield, Tex. |              |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 389 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include newspaper articles and other items.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and to include articles from Mr. Donaldson.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of competition between the railroads and airlines.

Mr. HESS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Cincinnati Inquirer.

#### THE SUGAR BILL

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill H. R. 4075.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a Gallup poll.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona, Mr. NORBLAD, and Mr. ROBERTSON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

#### INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides consideration of H. R. 3950, a bill to reduce individual income-tax payments. This rule also waives points of order against the bill and prohibits amendments, except those offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. The type of closed rule embodied in this resolution is customary in tax legislation, and the procedure of bringing tax legislation to the floor under a closed rule has been long established in practice by both parties.

A bill of this nature offers a wonderful opportunity for Members to express their views on a number of subjects, but, unfortunately, time is now an important factor. This bill must be passed by the House quickly, so that the Senate will be able to act on it and get it to the President by the end of the week. Allowing 10 days for the President to consider the bill, the Congress will still have time to override in case of a veto.

This bill does not necessitate any discussion on my part. We all understand it. We passed a similar bill earlier this session, and we were enlightened by 6 hours of debate at that time. This is the same bill, except that the provisions of this bill become effective January 1, 1948. In view of this fact and in consideration

of the pressure of other business, this resolution limits debate to 2 hours.

I had planned to discuss the need for this legislation and to make some observations on the advisability of reducing taxes at this time. But as time is an important factor, I will limit myself to a brief observation as to the importance of drafting tax legislation that will encourage incentive.

One of the finest instincts of a normal man is his desire to provide for the future security of himself and his family. Now, the present tax laws, which strike at the very roots of personal incentive, should rightly be a matter of deep concern to every thoughtful American. People generally do not realize what has been done to them in the past 10 years. With income and estate taxes and interest rates at their present levels, it is virtually impossible for a young man to accumulate a competency for his old age. The present personal income taxes make the development of small business a well-nigh insurmountable task. Even an exceptionally able man cannot look forward to self-provided financial security in his old age under our present tax law. This situation must be remedied. We should never forget that, while the welfare of the so-called common man is of vital importance, it is only through the initiative and ingenuity of the uncommonly gifted individual that the general well-being of all of our people can be advanced.

Political freedom will not long endure in the absence of a financially independent, self-reliant citizenry. The dynamic character of the American economy will also wither away unless ambitious, enterprising individuals are enabled to plow back into their business an adequate portion of the fruits of their efforts. A steady flow of new and successful enterprises into the economic bloodstream of the Nation is essential to the continued operation of our private competitive business system. Furthermore, the inner fiber of our people will be insidiously weakened if the prospect of a self-respecting, independent old age is virtually destroyed. The quality of our business leadership will also suffer in the years ahead if some means is not devised by which adequate financial incentives can be provided for those of the rising generation who must shortly assume the grave responsibility of directing the existing business enterprises of this country. Incentive is important. Without it, this Nation would deteriorate and pass from existence. Our tax laws should be an incentive for our citizens to provide themselves a better standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule is rapidly passed, that both the House and the Senate will pass the bill and that the President will sign it. In the event he does not, I feel the Congress will be justified in overriding his veto.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has consumed 6 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### REPUBLICAN REVENUE BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if the chairman of the Committee on Rules were as candid in explaining the provisions of the bill and the need for the bill as he is in describing the rule, I would, of course, congratulate him. His description of the rule makes it clear that it is a gag rule of the worst form. Naturally we have passed rules like this before on tariff and complicated tax bills which deprived the Members of the opportunity to offer amendments. Only the holier-than-thou Committee on Ways and Means has the privilege to offer any amendment under this rule. The Members, of course, will have the right to vote on them.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I was amazed this morning when the Pastor offered his prayer to observe only four Republicans on the floor, and that at a time when they were especially in need of the Chaplain's prayer for guidance.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, stated that the bill is for the protection of future generations. This, of course, saying the least, is a very lame justification for the bill. It would be in the interest of future generations if we were to start now, while the country is prosperous, to reduce our great public indebtedness to avoid saddling upon the future generations this tremendous burden. The fact is that this bill is in the interest of a few thousand of the wealthiest people of the Nation by reducing their income taxes by nearly \$4,000,000,000.

#### BUSINESS NEEDS NO FURTHER STIMULATION

Another reason that is given to urge the enactment of this legislation is that the bill will aid and stimulate business and will serve as an incentive to increase business. This plea is made as though business needed additional funds in order to exist or continue; yet I read in the New York Times just a few days ago, as well as in other reputable financial papers, that some 228 outstanding corporations during the first 3 months of this year made a profit 305 percent above the great profits they enjoyed in 1946; and notwithstanding the fact that all the corporations have a great backlog of orders, and have more business on hand, that will assure them of greater production and, naturally, greater profits, and that they have more cash, greater bank balances, reserves and surpluses than ever in their history. Therefore, it is ridiculous for anyone to claim that they need this reduction in taxes to stimulate and increase their business.

#### REPUBLICAN MISRULE BEGOT STAGGERING DEBT

The President vetoed the first tax bill, and his main reason was that if there was ever a time to start to reduce the great public debt this is the time, when the country is as prosperous as it is. We will not be able to reduce the debt if we reach such prosperous years as the country suffered from under 12 years of Republican misrule, especially during the 4 years of Hoover prosperity; and, by the way, much of the debt that has been in-

curred was because of the Republican administration under President Hoover which made it necessary for President Roosevelt and the Democratic Congress to put the country back on its feet, feed the hungry, save the municipalities, the States, the banks, insurance companies, railroads, and the business of the Nation. Naturally, a great deal of money had to be expended to restore America, to make it the country of prosperity that we have enjoyed under a Democratic administration. I hope we will continue to be prosperous, that people will continue to be employed at a high wage, and that business will make fair and reasonable profits on their investments.

#### HAMILTON'S POLICIES ABANDONED

I regret that the Republicans have failed to follow the founder of the Republican Party, Alexander Hamilton, who advised and recommended that it would be for the best interests of the country to reduce its indebtedness. It was Hamilton's belief and practice that no debt should be incurred until the means of retiring it had been established. I have a report from Dun & Bradstreet and from outstanding businessmen as well as financiers who plead and insist that our duty now is to begin the reduction of the tremendous debt brought about by Republican misrule and the unfortunate war, which also, by the way, was brought about because the Republicans failed to approve the League of Nations. If the League of Nations had been approved and we had been members of the League of Nations, Germany and Japan never could have prepared for war and we would not have been saddled with the great debt for the war.

Mr. Speaker, it is our solemn duty to begin to reduce the country's indebtedness in order to protect the value of billions of dollars of our outstanding bonds held by patriotic Americans; to keep the country and dollar sound; to safeguard the solvency of our Government; and to hold down the interest rates on our outstanding indebtedness. I make this assertion because only this morning I observed that the interest rates have been increased by the banks to 3.1 percent which will force us to pay additional millions to the bankers on our refinancing.

#### TAX REDUCTIONS BENEFIT THE RICH

I concede that this bill provides for the reduction of individual income taxes and it will be the hue and cry of the Republicans that the bill will reduce taxes. Yes, it will reduce taxes as I have stated by about \$4,000,000,000, but for whom? Nearly all of this great sum will inure to the benefit of the prosperous, money-making, high-salaried, and bonus-drawing officers and officials, and the wealthy groups. I feel it is my duty to show in plain figures whose taxes will be reduced. I have here a correct and official table giving the spendable income after tax in various income brackets and it shows a man earning \$1,200 will have a tax reduction of 21 cents weekly while the millionaire will enjoy an additional spendable income of \$8,695.69 weekly. The table which I insert at this point shows more fully the spendable income

inuring to various income groups, as follows:

| Net income before personal exemption | Married person—no dependents        |                    |            |                            |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|----------------------------|
|                                      | Spendable income after tax (amount) |                    |            |                            |
|                                      | Present law                         | H. R. 1 as amended | Difference | Difference on weekly basis |
| \$1,200.....                         | \$1,162                             | \$1,173            | \$11       | \$0.21                     |
| \$1,500.....                         | 1,405                               | 1,433              | 28         | .54                        |
| \$2,000.....                         | 1,810                               | 1,867              | 57         | 1.09                       |
| \$4,000.....                         | 3,411                               | 3,529              | 118        | 2.27                       |
| \$6,000.....                         | 4,955                               | 5,164              | 209        | 4.02                       |
| \$10,000.....                        | 7,815                               | 8,252              | 437        | 8.40                       |
| \$25,000.....                        | 15,918                              | 17,734             | 1,816      | 34.92                      |
| \$50,000.....                        | 25,205                              | 30,164             | 4,959      | 95.37                      |
| \$100,000.....                       | 36,473                              | 49,498             | 12,625     | 242.79                     |
| \$500,000.....                       | 92,536                              | 137,926            | 65,390     | 1,257.50                   |
| \$1,000,000.....                     | 160,286                             | 271,176            | 110,890    | 2,132.50                   |
| \$5,000,000.....                     | 1,725,000                           | 1,177,176          | 452,176    | 8,695.69                   |

<sup>1</sup> Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 85.5 percent.

Mr. Speaker, from an examination of this table every one must realize that this bill reduces the income taxes of the low-earning groups by a few pennies and of the wealthy by thousands of dollars.

The National Association of Manufacturers and the financial lobby who urge this legislation will endeavor to make the people believe that the Democrats are opposed to a reduction of taxes, satisfied that very few people are overjoyed by paying taxes. If I did not believe that in the interest of our Nation, as I said before, it is our solemn duty to reduce our great indebtedness, and could bring myself to vote for income-tax reduction, still I could not play into the hands of these selfish gentlemen who urge upon us a bill which reduces the taxes of the lowest income groups by pennies and at the same time increases by tenfold their cost of living. In other words, the people of small incomes are taxed indirectly through the increased cost of necessities produced and controlled by the same interests which support this measure.

#### CANNOT FOOL THE PEOPLE

It is my firm belief that no amount of big business propaganda, nor hypocritical explanations, will ram down the throats of the small taxpayers of this country the false claims that this bill is designed to reduce their taxes.

You are paying no heed to history when you rush this unfair bill through without pause, in an autocratic disregard of measured thought and debate which is equal to the dictatorial methods of Uncle Joe Cannon, czar of the House, when he was Speaker.

You are disregarding the counsels of Alexander Hamilton and of Andrew Mellon.

And you fail to appreciate the sage advice of Abraham Lincoln when he said:

You can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more observations to make, but many members of the Rules Committee and others desire to give expression on this rule, and in the hope they will bring about a realization to the Republicans and the mem-

bership that the rule should be defeated and that this bill ought to be buried, that we follow the advice of President Truman and all outstanding and fair-minded financiers and businessmen of the Nation, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I insert at this point a portion of a news story from the New York Times of June 22 which refutes the theory that business needs the stimulation of personal income-tax reductions in the highest and most privileged brackets:

PLANT EARNINGS UP 305 PERCENT IN LAST YEAR—  
228 INDUSTRIAL MANUFACTURERS SHOW TOTAL OF \$597,553,217 FOR FIRST 1947 QUARTER—  
DECLINE IN STRIKES HELPS—DIP IN TAXES ALSO CONTRIBUTES TO IMPROVEMENT AS OUTPUT TOPS AUGUST 1945 MARK

(By C. M. Reckert)

Consolidated net income of 228 industrial manufacturers in the first quarter of this year rose 305 percent to \$597,553,217 from the \$147,665,103 return of the same companies in the initial 3 months of last year, according to our survey of official earnings statements.

The improvement in income for the quarter resulted not only from an increased return due to higher prices and lower taxes, but primarily from a larger volume of operations. This was borne out by industrial production throughout the March quarter, which was maintained at the highest monthly rate since August 1945, when it was 186 percent of capacity. Industrial activity, as measured by the Federal Reserve Board's adjusted index of the 1935-39 average, reached 189 percent of capacity in each of the first 3 months.

While the earnings increase seems to be remarkable, it must be realized that many abnormal conditions affected business in the comparable period of 1946. Industrial output during the initial quarter a year ago was the lowest since the war's end, because of major industrial strikes. Consequently, transition to peacetime manufacture was impeded and unfilled orders continued to accumulate. This year many companies enjoyed the benefit of sizeable refunds from tax credits; a year ago contracts were still being canceled and settlements effected.

#### THE TAX IMPOSED BY BUSINESS ON THE PEOPLE

In yesterday morning's Washington Post, Mr. Speaker, I noticed a headline, "Bank earnings gain largest in 19 years," followed by a story showing an increase of 25.5 percent in bank earnings in the members of the Richmond Reserve Bank, followed by an exposition of the big increase in railroad earnings and a new record in retail sales by Sears, Roebuck & Co. The same thing is true of every efficient commercial and industrial enterprise in the country.

But in the Chicago Times of June 29, a little over a week ago, there was another kind of a news story—a sort of "in memorium" for the Office of Price Administration. This shows how, to gain those inordinate and extortionate profits, the business community has laid their own private tax on the earnings of every man and woman in the United States, and this bill does not hold a candle to this unauthorized and unofficial business tax.

#### PRICES STILL UP YEAR AFTER OPA

Prices are higher, goods more plentiful, 1 year after OPA came to its riotous death June 30, 1946.

(The Federal price fixing agency, you'll recall, showed faint stirrings of life for a time when a new measure was substituted for the one vetoed by President Truman. But it went to final rest in December, with its remaining powers transferred to other agencies.)

#### DEBATE RAGES ON

The nylon lines are gone now. Under-the-counter deals for scarce items are going. Butchers have lost their glamor for housewives. But this last may be only momentary. Stocks of meat, poultry, and dairy products are on a hand-to-mouth basis, according to the Department of Agriculture.

A cross-country survey showed advocates and opponents of OPA no nearer agreement than ever on the value of the agency. Those for OPA argue that prices have risen spectacularly, that supply increases in the few items that have shown signs of declining would have developed just as quickly under OPA. Those "agin" argue that goods are more easily available, that the black market has been eliminated and that OPA was unenforceable unless backed by wartime patriotism.

The cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on May 15, released this week was 155.8. Last June it was 133.3. Since that time, fats and oils have risen 58.6 percent, meat 52.2 percent, beverages 60.6 percent, sugar and sweets 31.6 percent.

Hogs which had a ceiling of \$14.85 a year ago are bringing \$25.25 per 100 pounds in the Chicago market today. Butter which sold at 56½ cents a pound wholesale is bringing 66½ cents. (Last year, producers were receiving a Government subsidy of 15 cents a pound on butter.)

#### CORN UP TO \$2.15

Most spectacular grain at the moment is corn, selling in Chicago this week end at \$2.12½ to \$2.15 a bushel, against an OPA ceiling of \$1.46½.

A sharp rise in hide and finished leather is given as a reason for higher shoe costs.

"The fall line of men's suits and overcoats will be higher in price, mainly as a result of a 15 percent wage increase in the clothing industry in December," Mayer Kestnbaum, president, Hart Schaffner & Marx, said.

One year ago a popular brand of soap sold at three bars for 18 cents, but advertisements carried the words "when available." Today the soap is 10 cents a bar, with no remarks about availability.

A year ago men's white shirts were one to a customer. Today they are being sold without limit.

#### PRESIDENT POINTED OUT FAULTS

This tax bill suffers from every fault pointed out by the President in his veto message of H. R. 1 except for the single and not too important matter of the effective date.

It is a patchwork bill hastily thrown together by the unofficial and unauthorized tax advisers of the Committee on Ways and Means merely to fulfill some of the unthinking campaign pledges of some Republican candidates last fall.

As the President pointed out, if this bill becomes law its inequities become frozen into the crazy-quilt pattern of Federal taxation law.

What is needed is a long-term revision of all revenue laws.

During the war years we had to improvise.

The imposition of taxes was an important and valuable part of the war effort, not only to raise revenues for the prosecution of the war but also to fight democracy's battles.

The May 1947 issue of Dun's Review contains an illuminating article on debt retirement versus tax reduction by Roy A. Foulke, vice president of Dun & Bradstreet, which quotes both Hamilton and Albert Gallatin, and reviews the history of the public debt.

No one will accuse Dun & Bradstreet of being a democratic or liberal organization, so I am going to quote just a few paragraphs of advice from Mr. Foulke's article.

He says:

In the light of the variety of conflicting opinions, the following four basic objectives, listed in the order of their importance, would seem to be the elements of sound business policy for consideration in determining taxation legislation at this time:

1. That Federal personal income-tax legislation be made to apply from June 30 to June 30 to coincide with the fiscal year of the Federal Government. \* \* \*

2. That every possible cent be saved in the operations of the manifold departments, divisions, bureaus, agencies, and corporations of the Federal Government. \* \* \*

3. That the Federal debt be reduced at the rate of at least \$5,000,000,000 yearly.

4. That the over-all average reductions in personal income-tax rates for the fiscal year 1947-48 range between 5 and 10 percent, and that the reduction in 1948-49 be based on the size of the surplus in 1947-48 with an anticipated surplus of \$5,000,000,000 for continued debt reduction. In any such legislation, consideration should be given to the equalization of taxes to be paid individuals with the same exemptions and the same incomes throughout the country, by enacting provisions which would be uniform with those of the existing nine community-property States.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a few articles from outstanding men, and some letters.)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I hope to see the time come when people in political life will cease to direct their barbs at ex-President Hoover. I never have found it pleasing to join in the criticism to which he has been subjected. I think he is one of the great world influences, and I would like to see his wisdom more often brought to bear upon our domestic and world problems.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules felt justified in bringing this bill back to the House because of sustained public interest in tax reduction. Of course, the history of the bill is fresh in the minds of Members, and the conviction of this House and of the Senate as heretofore expressed is to the effect that something ought to be done to give hope and encouragement to people who are producing.

Mr. Speaker, private enterprise cannot survive under a system of taxation that is confiscatory. I am not unmindful of the fact in making this statement that the public debt is enormous, and that any country's system of taxation must follow the public debt. We should, and I think we must, however, consider the question as to how much of the citizen's earnings can government afford to take without destroying maximum effort.

People labor and strive in the hope and in the expectation of enjoying in the main the fruits of their efforts. Government has been laying an enormous burden upon the taxpayers, and to indicate an intention of easing up on the load would, in my opinion, be a tremendous stimulus to business. I think the psychological effect of adopting this bill would be good, and I think evidence of its influence upon the citizens would become immediately apparent. To continue the levying of a tax to take the major part of the citizen's earnings and do it from year to year and make it a permanent policy of government could, and would, in my opinion, change the very nature of our people; in other words, if the Government is to take all that the worker earns except enough to support the individual living in a very modest sort of a way, then the man with one talent is just as well off as the man with 10.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will adopt the pending resolution and that the Congress will pass the bill overwhelmingly.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the words just said by the gentleman from Georgia in reference to President Hoover.

Mr. Speaker, in 1930 the outgo of this Government was \$3,440,000,000 and the income was \$4,178,000,000, and we had a surplus of \$738,000,000 in 1930. Seventeen years later, last year, 1946-47 the outgo was \$42,505,000,000 and the income was \$43,259,000,000. We had a surplus this year, for the first time in 17 years, of \$754,000,000. That was due to the election last fall, for it resulted in a cutting down of Government expenses. Thanks to the Republican Party.

In 1930 the national debt was about \$18,000,000,000. The national debt at the present time is \$258,000,000,000. In those 17 New Deal years the national debt increased 1,700 percent, the outgo increased 1,400 percent, and the income increased 1,000 percent.

What are we trying to do here in cutting down the load on the taxpayers? We are not trying to do it with the idea of endangering our solvency, but we want to give the people of this country the opportunity to display the vigor they have always had under the private enterprise system in getting out and doing things, creating jobs, improving equipment. Too many people today are handicapped and do not want to work because they say, "What is the use? The Government takes everything I earn." We want to give the worker an opportunity to be thrifty, he can improve his property, and his position. He can feel as if his Government can help him by cutting his taxes, but above all, he wants the expense of Government cut and cut to the bone. He wants this extravagance terminated, in the operation of his government. That is what the Republicans stand for. Now, what do we want to do as good American citizens? We want to put this tax bill into

effect, and then we want to start chopping down these Government expenses. We want to cut out every dollar in the operation of Government that we possibly can. And we can cut it many, many hundreds of millions of dollars.

I take my hat off to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for the duties they have performed during this session of Congress. I want to tell you it is a marvelous thing the way they work. It is marvelous the way the Committee on Appropriations has cut down these expenses. They deserve the support of all Members and the thanks of the general public. But the American people will never see the results fully attained until we have somebody in the executive branch of the Government who is going to work the same as they do in the legislative branch of the Government. We need cooperation and we get nothing but veto.

If we want to get this country on its feet, that is the duty which you must perform and which I must perform. By encouraging thrift, creating jobs and opening up opportunity.

Here is another thing we must be careful about, and that is in our spending for relief in foreign countries. We cannot take the burdens of every nation in the world upon our shoulders and expect this country to survive.

Here is an article I saw in the paper yesterday:

LADY ASTOR OFFERS TO STAY IN UNITED STATES TO CANCEL BRITISH DEBT

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA., July 5.—Lady Nancy Astor, peppery Virginia-born socialite who won a seat in the British House of Commons by virtue of her wits and a wise marriage, kindly offered to stay in the United States for good today if we would cancel Britain's debts to this country—only \$5,000,000,000 or so.

I say to Lady Astor, if she is more interested in Britain than she is in America, then she ought to go back to Britain where she found her last love because we want people in America who are going to protect America. We want people in America who are going to be for America and save America. That is the duty you have to perform and that is the duty I have to perform. I am going to do my duty to the best of my ability. Lady Astor gave up America for Britain; now she wants to get America for the Empire. I am against it.

Now, what we can do to encourage the people of this country is to pass this tax bill. I hope the Senate will do likewise and that the President will see the error of his vetoes and sign this bill, because it is going to be essential if we are going to keep our country solvent, if we are going to pay off our national debt, and if we are going to do the things for the people of America that we ought to do. We want to pay our debts. After World War I they reduced the tax bill four times and cut our national debt from twenty-seven and one-half billions to sixteen billions. We today can cut the taxes and cut expenses of Government and reduce our national debt by ten billions a year if we do the right

thing and put more business into Government and less Government into business. Less taxes, less expenses, less Government in business.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Georgia as to former President Hoover. Some time ago I found pleasure in voting to change the name of one of our great dams in his honor. But it must not be forgotten that Mr. Hoover in the minds of the American people represents an era. I think that was all my distinguished friend from Illinois had in mind in making the reference that he did. Mr. Hoover happened to be President at the end of something like a dozen years of Republican rule, and it was unfortunate for him to be the one holding the hen-house door open when the chickens came home to roost at the end of that 12 years. And the Hoover era will not soon be forgotten by the American people.

I voted against the tax bill and to sustain the recent veto of the President. I know of no reason why I should now change that position. Certainly, changing the date of the bill 6 months does not constitute such a reason. I voted against the tax bill because this Nation is in debt a great deal more than anybody conceived to be possible a dozen or 15 years ago. If we were to pay \$25,000,000,000 on our national debt in the next fiscal year, it would not be too much. It would not be 10 percent of what the Government owes.

Our policy as a Nation, foreign and domestic, must be based upon the financial stability of our Government. Bonds that have been bought by millions of people throughout the country must be kept absolutely sound, as we face a rather uncertain future. If we cannot substantially reduce the debt of this Nation when people are prosperous and the Nation is prosperous, when in the name of Heaven are we going to do it. Oh, it is all right to talk about the psychological effect, but the American people are making money right now. We are in the best position we will probably be in for 20 or 25 years to make a substantial reduction of this debt. Drastic reduction of the national debt would make sound the program which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], referred to. But as matters now stand it is proposed to make a reduction of only 1 percent on the largest debt the world has ever known. Yesterday the Congress authorized the payment of terminal leave bonds in cash. Circumstances were such that I could not be here, but had I been I would have voted for that measure, because it was but an act of justice to the rank and file who bore the heat and burden of the day in the recent war. But all the same it is taking \$2,000,000,000 out of the United States Treasury. The passage of this tax bill will shut off \$4,000,000,000 more from the Treasury. So that in 2 days the record of this House is to take \$6,000,000,000 out of the Government Treasury and put it into spend-

ing channels. I do not base my opinion upon statistics or the theory of some economists, but you go out and ask the average housewife and she will tell you mighty quick and very willingly whether or not we have inflation. We are playing with fire. To reduce taxes at this time of uncertainty by \$4,000,000,000, in the face of obligations that necessarily confront us in our foreign and domestic policy, seems to me wholly unjustified.

Of course everybody wants tax relief, but debt reduction should come before tax reduction and in good spirits I must express my deliberate judgment that if all politics were stricken out of this bill there would be nothing left but the enacting clause.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether this Nation at this time can afford to reduce taxes and thereby reduce the income of the Government is a question so grave that it transcends all political, all party, and all personal considerations. It is a question of whether this Congress proposes to maintain, or restore if you please, the solvency of this Government. We are confronted with the greatest debt ever known in the history of any country—over \$250,000,000,000. We were burdened with a proportionately large debt after the First World War. When the Republican Party came into power at that time they proceeded to pay that debt—and I think it is a compliment that should be paid to them—and put this Nation upon a financially sound and solid basis. Now, in this hour, when the income of the Nation is greater than ever, when the ability to pay this debt will never be equaled again in our time, it is proposed to reduce taxes, reduce the revenues of the Government, and place ourselves in a position where we will never pay this debt in our time, or any substantial portion of it. Is it fair or is it honest to bequeath this huge burden to future generations, who had no part in creating it?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to yield.

I have searched my conscience in the effort to find an excuse and a reason to go along with some of my friends who felt that we could afford to make this change in our tax policy the first of next year. I cannot do it. I cannot find that we are in any different position than we were when I voted against this bill just a few weeks ago.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I decline to yield and I regret to do so, but I merely want to express to the House my own individual views on this matter without attempting to influence the views of anyone else. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as all Members in this House, are acting upon their conscience

in this matter; but it is a grave matter. If you do not pay this debt now you are never going to pay it. It is said that we are going to have a surplus and going to pay a substantial part of this debt. What are you going to pay? Your own figures in the report show that we would pay \$2,600,000,000, I believe it is. That is 1 percent of this great debt created in our generation. By that policy you propose to continue the payment of that debt for 100 years.

In this time of inflation when every pressure is toward further inflation let us get down to solid, sound finance and pay as much as we can upon this debt, because when you return to normalcy, you gentlemen on both sides of the aisle know that you are not going to make these large payments on the debt. It is estimated in the committee report on this bill that we are going to raise so much revenue next year—estimated. What is an estimate? After all is said and done an estimate is nothing more than a polite name for a wild guess, because nobody knows what the revenue is going to be next year, and nobody in this room knows what the expenditures are going to be for the next fiscal year. This House made a great gesture for economy. It passed bills cutting the President's budget and yet they go to another body, pressure groups are on them every moment of the day, and you are going to see those bills come back here this year as you have in past years, come back here greatly increased. In addition to the appropriation bills what about the expenditures you are authorizing here every day? I happen to be a member of the Rules Committee and every day before that committee now are coming bills asking for authorizations that are going to increase the payments you have got to make out of the Treasury. Your budget does not tell you what you are going to spend. Oh, no; these authorizations that Congress passes are the things that tell you what you are going to spend. And what is happening about them now upstairs in the Rules Committee where they are presented before they come to the floor? Let us see. Just a week or so ago you passed a wool-subsidy bill. A lot of the Members say they do not like subsidies, that they do not believe in subsidies, and they protest against subsidies, but in wartime subsidies are necessary. I never believed in subsidies. I do not like them in war and I certainly do not like subsidies in peacetime. But what has happened about subsidies and what is happening every day about subsidies? Just the other day you voted up a bill for \$100,000,000 for a subsidy on wool. Then a few days later comes along another subsidy and great pressure from certain groups for this subsidy because it is going to happen to help some individuals who may be Members of this House who come from certain parts of the country. We pass out a bill that is going to pay \$80,000,000 subsidy on the production of certain metals. Do you think that bill is going to pass?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes. I wonder whether the gentleman has been informed that the rate of interest today has increased three points due to existing conditions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, yes; all our expenses are going to increase. While we have the money, while everybody has plenty of money, we ought to reduce the debt. I know it is a hard duty to perform. It is hard for me to stand up here and vote against giving my constituents and myself a tax reduction, but somebody has got to do it if we are going to put this Nation on a sound basis. That is the problem after all that is presented to you today. Never mind all this talk that you ought to relieve this group from taxes or you ought to relieve that group from taxes. That is all politics. Let us get down to sound stuff. The dollar in your pocket is only as sound as the Government behind it. What we ought to do is relieve our Government of the insolvency with which it is threatened today after 18 years of unbalanced budgets. Let us think about this seriously.

Now, getting back to subsidies, we are paying a subsidy of nearly \$450,000,000 for the mail of this country, for the benefit of certain groups—friends of yours, friends of mine—but we are paying that subsidy out of the Treasury of the United States just the same as if we handed them the money to the extent of \$450,000,000. What has happened? Your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has brought in a bill asking that this subsidy be done away with and we save \$400,000,000. Is this Congress going to do it?

Not on your life. You are not going to get a chance to vote on it even if you wanted to.

What about our merchant marine? We have reached the point where conditions in the merchant marine are such that it costs three times as much to operate a vessel of the United States as any of our competitors. Do you think we are going to let the merchant marine die? No. You are going to pay a subsidy. You tell me about your estimates of what money you are going to have left over. You cannot tell anything about estimates until you get through voting on bills for these authorizations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to observations made by some outstanding Secretaries of the Treasury in the history of our country on the question of tax reduction versus debt reduction. One hundred and fifty years ago Alexander Hamilton had this very question presented to him as Secretary of the Treasury after the Revolutionary War where there was a demand for a tax reduction at a time when the debt of our country was abnormally high, just the same as it is now.

Alexander Hamilton made a historic report to the Congress at that time, com-

ing out absolutely in favor of debt reduction as against tax reduction, and in part he said:

Some men declaim against the public debt and for the reduction of it as an abstract thesis yet are vehement against every plan of taxation which is proposed to discharge old debts or avoid new ones.

Secretary Gallatin remarked in his report for 1805 that—

A persevering application of the resources afforded by seasons of peace and prosperity, to the discharge of the principal . . . is the only effectual mode by which the United States can ultimately obtain the full command of their revenue, and the free disposal of all their resources.

He further said:

A diminution of that interest—

On the debt—

is, with respect to the ability of defraying the other annual expenses, a positive increase of revenue, to the same amount.

In 1924, Secretary Mellon pointed out that once governmental expenditures were consistent with efficiency, and he said:

Debt reduction is the best method of bringing about tax reduction. Aside from gradually refunding at lower rates of interest it is the only method of reducing the heavy annual interest charge.

Now, we have a national debt of \$258,000,000,000, roughly speaking, with our income at the high level it is, and now we are going to reduce our taxes together with other inflationary influences. We are taking the dangerous journey of tax reduction as against debt reduction. The sound thing to do, the course to take for sound money, the course to take for good business, the course to take to make our Government bonds more protective for those who have invested in them, such as insurance companies, banks, and individuals, is to reduce the national debt rather than at this time, in the life of our Nation's history, take the dangerous course of reducing our income taxes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. In view of the fact that the proposal before us is to initiate tax reduction next year, do I understand from the gentleman's statement that he is opposed to all tax reduction next year?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am opposed to tax reduction until the national debt has been substantially reduced, and I take that position in the interest of sound government, sound money, sound business, and in the interest of our people. I cannot understand how it is that the majority party, the Republican Party, contrary to the history of the great leaders of its party in the past, is taking a journey directly in the opposite direction to that which is consistent with the best interest of our country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Then do I properly interpret the gentleman's statement and answer as meaning, on his part, that he is against tax reduction next year?

Mr. McCORMACK. The position of the gentleman from Massachusetts is that he is against tax reduction until there has been a very substantial debt reduction.

Mr. HALLECK. This bill, as I pointed out, and as the gentleman knows, seeks to give tax reduction next year.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that.

Mr. HALLECK. Therefore, it seems to me clear that what the gentleman is saying is that he would be against any tax bill that would reduce taxes next year, because certainly there could be no determination as to money to be applied on the payment of the public debt next year until the year is concluded.

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as I am concerned, I take the same position that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] took; that as between tax reduction and debt reduction at this time, having in mind our national debt, I think that it is imperative and I consider it in the best interest of our country, much as we might like to give reduction in our taxes, to take the course that will bring about as quickly as possible as substantial a reduction of our national debt as we can while the national income is high and revenue is coming into our Government.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. It appears very clear to me by what the gentleman is saying that he would oppose any kind of tax reduction for the taxpayers of this country next year, and hence maintain in effect the extremely high level of wartime taxes during that year so far removed from the war itself.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as I am concerned, I would regret very much seeing any tax-reduction bill. One equalizing and applying more fairly without a diminution of the revenue would be a different proposition. However, I would regret seeing any tax bill passed now or next year that would sharply reduce the revenue of the Government. I prefer that any surplus be used for debt reduction. I consider that as quick a debt reduction as we possibly can make is the best kind of a tax reduction we can make, and at the same time it is the best assurance of protection of business, bonds, bank deposits, and everything else. It is also an insurance against inflationary tendencies. It is my position that as between tax reduction and debt reduction at this time, I favor debt reduction.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES].

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to remind the two distinguished gentlemen who just addressed the House, the gentleman from Virginia

[Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], of a grave omission in their remarks. I am glad they grant proper recognition to the fact that Republican administrations made substantial reductions of the national debt in the 1920's. They should have mentioned the equally significant fact, however, that the Republicans during that same period reduced Federal taxes four different times. My party reduced the national debt not by clinging to excessive and burdensome wartime tax rates but by promptly terminating all emergency agencies, by cutting out non-essential activities, and by practicing real economy and efficiency in government. My party demonstrated 25 years ago exactly what we are urging here today, namely, that a reduction in tax rates does not necessarily mean a reduction in revenue; but that a reduction, intelligently formulated and timed, offers added incentives to all economic groups which can actually increase the flow of revenue into the Treasury.

I recognize the sincerity of the gentlemen, and feel as they do that we must promptly undertake an orderly program of debt retirement. But I believe we can best insure surplus revenues for debt payment by trimming costs of government to the bone and at the same time by offering our tax-stifled economy some relief and some real added incentive.

Let me call to the attention of the House a type of expenditures by the departments and agencies which I believe every Member on both sides of the aisle will agree are largely waste and extravagance. It is just such unwarranted and improper activities as these I shall describe for you that deprive the American taxpayers of the relief they deserve and should have today. The Democratic members of my committee join me in this criticism of unwarranted Federal expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, the highest-priced publicity staff in the world, employed by the Federal Government, is swamping newspaper offices with an unprecedented flood of news releases. Some of this material, of course, contains useful information. But a lot of it, also, is sheer propaganda designed to influence public thinking and to bring pressure on Congress. And much of it is just pure "hog wash."

The House on April 28, 1947, authorized the Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to investigate publicity and propaganda activities of the Federal Government.

In an attempt to get some idea of the amount of publicity and propaganda being issued by the Federal agencies in the form of official press releases, the subcommittee—of which I am chairman—recently wrote to a group of outstanding newspapers requesting that they save all such material received from the Federal agencies during a single week. I would like at this time to call attention to the material forwarded to the committee office by one newspaper, the New York Times, as a result of that request.

I would also like to call attention to the reply from Mr. A. Kirchofer, of the Buffalo Evening News. He said:

The enclosed material is all that came to our office this week. This is certainly not a typical week. Someone must have been tipped off that you were conducting a survey.

Be that as it may, here is the material received from the New York Times. As the Members can see, it is a stack nearly a foot high. Considering the thousands of newspapers there are in the country, even the hundreds that have their own representatives in Washington—and even making allowance for the obvious assumption that all did not receive all the material the Times received—still, it is apparent from this package received by this one newspaper during a single week that the publicity output of the Federal agencies is tremendous.

Perhaps hard-pressed newspaper publishers might receive from this some slight indication of what causes the chronic paper shortage. This may also give our hard-pressed taxpayers some idea why Federal expenditures continue so high the President felt it necessary to veto a bill which would have granted some income-tax relief. It took some money to gather and prepare this material, and it took money to hire the stenographers and typists, and the people who ran the mimeograph machines that ground out this material.

Yes, it took money to prepare this material—a surprising amount of money. The latest available estimate placed Federal expenditures for publicity purposes at about \$75,000,000 a year. And it was estimated that around 45,000 Federal employees were engaged either part time or full time in the preparation of publicity material; and, I might say here, this is typical of a lot of New Deal spending.

In order to get some idea of what is involved in this material, I requested the Public Printer to estimate roughly how many columns of newsprint would have been consumed had all this material been used. He estimated that it would have required 800 columns or 100 pages of the New York Times, making no allowance for advertising or feature material.

Put this in terms of your own home town newspaper, and you will see that most papers could not possibly have printed all this publicity material from the Federal agencies had they thrown out all other news. Take the case of a newspaper averaging 30 pages a day, 7 days a week, and allow 40 percent for advertising. They would have had exactly 26 pages left for the entire week, for comics, features, and all other news.

And please understand that the material considered here does not include the numerous pamphlets on every item under the sun the agencies are constantly pouring out.

Let me repeat that this material contained some worth-while information that was of real value to the press and to the public. I do not contend that all of it should be shut off. I do contend that much of it could be dispensed with, that

the public press simply cannot absorb all of it.

I shall not take the time of the House to analyze any substantial portion of this material, but I would like to call attention to some of the items, to show the Members what they are getting for this \$75,000,000 a year.

There were, for instance, 64 sheets of material dealing with the State Department's foreign broadcasts. Could there have been any coincidence between the release of this flood of material, and the fact the issue of those broadcasts was under consideration by Congress at the time? I believe the Members know the answers to that one.

And here is another item, this one from the Office of the Housing Expediter. Let me quote from it:

At least 1,000,000 dwelling units of all types, of which about 750,000 will be new permanent homes, will be completed this year if controls on residential construction are continued for a few more months, Housing Expediter Frank R. Creeden said today. It will be the best year on housing completions since the middle twenties, he added.

I will not take time to read the whole release, but let me just pick up one more paragraph:

It must be emphasized, however—

This release continues—

that such a record home-building achievement will be possible only if controls are continued a few months longer on nonresidential construction. Right now there is a backlog of more than 2,000,000,000 in deferrable nonresidential projects being held up because of material shortages. If this pent-up demand were suddenly turned loose on the building-materials market, the resulting scramble for materials would leave the little fellow trying to build a home out in the cold, both literally and figuratively. It would be the lifting of L-41 all over again—only worse, because without price control, the sky would be the limit on the scarce building items.

If that is not propaganda, designed to influence Congress, I do not know what would be.

It was interesting to note that the War Department devoted a five-page 2,000-word release giving details on the President's private plane—including attention to such incidentals as "a large swivel and reclining chair, upholstered in two-tone blue barkweave cloth," which "may be rotated 360°," and has behind it "a bleached mahogany filing cabinet and a transparent plastic magazine rack"—but it dismisses its announcement of a "new, most powerful jet engine" in less than 200 words.

Then we have one from the Labor Department, titled "Home Building in Washington Area Well Above Last Year." This material might well be of interest to Washington readers, but was it not a waste of time and materials to have it mimeographed and distributed generally?

There is a 67-page single-spaced Daily Report on Foreign Broadcasts by the Foreign Broadcast Information Branch, Central Intelligence Group.

Then there is a nice little bit from the Coast Guard, which tells of the sighting

of the first iceberg of the season by the cutter *Mendota*, and goes on to say that—

For those on board who had never seen a berg, and perhaps for the old-timers, too, it was a thrilling experience. The terrible majesty and strange beauty of an iceberg—

This little gem continues—

made an unforgettable impression on all of us who gazed in awe and wonder on this monstrous oddity of the sea. As the cutter approached closer, the delicate blues and greens of the hard glacial ice were discernible. Our first berg resembled, roughly, an aircraft carrier in shape and size, being tabular or flat-topped with vertical cliff-like sides rising 30 feet above the surface and having a length estimated at 750 feet and beam of 200 feet.

I will not read any further, but there is much more of the same.

The Coast Guard was so anxious not to keep the public press waiting for this material that it had the item radioed back to Coast Guard headquarters here for release.

The War Department has a 400-word release from Paris, France, telling of a New York City girl celebrating a WAC birthday reunion in the French capital. One paragraph from this release tells us that—

Today's dinner was climaxed by cutting a large, beautifully decorated birthday cake bearing five candles to mark the anniversary. Following dinner, the Wacs and ex-Wacs topped off their day with a party at the officers' club at the St. Germain depot, American Graves Registration Command—located on the Seine River in the suburbs of Paris.

Vital information for the public press. Can you not just picture the excitement in the Times city room when that delicious morsel of copy was received?

Mr. Speaker, supplying necessary information to the public on the activities of its Federal Government is one thing. Flooding news offices with propaganda to influence congressional action, and meaningless blurbs designed purely to keep the name of a particular agency or department in the public eye is another. That sort of thing must stop. The Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda, although it was created but a short time ago, has already made considerable headway in that direction. As chairman of that committee, I confidently predict we will be able to report greater progress as time goes on.

My subcommittee is engaged in a relatively small action of the over-all battle against an entrenched bureaucracy which is bitterly resisting every effort to eliminate nonessential activities and to force real economy in Government.

But despite the bitter and powerful resistance, Congress is winning this battle because public sentiment is overwhelmingly supporting us. We can and should, therefore, enact these proposed tax reductions with confidence that they will in no way hinder regular payments against the national debt hereafter.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. HORAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4106) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. FOGARTY reserved all points of order against the bill.

#### INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1947

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3950) to reduce individual income-tax payments.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3950, with Mr. HERTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is entitled to 1 hour.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the time allotted to me, under the rule, 1 hour, to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the gentlemen from North Carolina, from Virginia, and from Massachusetts—and I name them in the order in which they spoke, CLARK, SMITH, and McCORMACK—deplore this legislation and hope it would not pass because of its untimeliness, because of the big national debt and other reasons too numerous to mention, I wonder why those gentlemen who now say we must not give tax relief to 49,500,000 harassed taxpayers did not get up and talk about the national debt in 1945 when the Ways and Means Committee brought in a tax bill that gave approximately \$6,000,000,000 relief to the corporations of America. And I will yield briefly to the gentleman from Massachusetts to explain.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman support the bill himself?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, sir; it was a good bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. What was that bill? That bill was merely to wipe out a lot of wartime taxes.

Mr. KNUTSON. What have we before us now but wartime taxes?

Mr. McCORMACK. But that was for the purpose—

Mr. KNUTSON. Ah, now—

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman said he would yield to me; he volunteered to yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; they were excise taxes, a double tax placed upon corporations during wartime. The gentleman knows that tax bill was entirely different than the one now before the House. The question of tax reduction and debt reduction present entirely different situations.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Who threw us overboard in conference and deserted the House on that very issue of giving to corporations one-half of the relief on excess-profits taxes?

Mr. KNUTSON. The Democratic Congress.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Minnesota and his Republican colleague from New York.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, we must have been pretty powerful to outvote the majority. The cold fact remains that, notwithstanding a deficit of nearly twenty billions a Democratic Congress voted to give nearly \$6,000,000,000 in tax relief to the corporations of America in 1945; and now, when it is proposed to give approximately \$4,000,000,000 to 49,500,000 harassed individual income-tax payers they hold up their hands in holy horror and say: "Look at the debt. We cannot do it with the size of the debt as it is at the present time." It just goes to show the world moves forward. It is the first time I have heard these same gentlemen talk about our debt for 15 years. They voted for every appropriation bill, they voted time after time to pile up the debt on the American people, and it is only now, when we are trying to give relief to the harassed taxpayers of the country, that they suddenly remember that there is a public debt which is of their doing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I cannot yield further. I am giving the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Doughton] 10 minutes of my time.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I cannot yield now.

Let us take a look at this bill. What does it propose to do? It is going to give tax relief to forty-nine and a half million people. Who of all of the speakers who have spoken against the bill mentioned the fact that the taxpayers of the United Kingdom have already had one tax reduction and that the people of Canada have had two tax reductions, the last of which went into effect on July 1 and granted relief of 29 percent? Oh, yes, it is all right for the people of the United Kingdom to get a tax reduction, it is all right for the people of Canada to get a tax reduction, but when the American people ask for tax reduction they say "No. You have to pay taxes in order to rehabilitate the world."

The President in effect says we cannot have a tax reduction because we cannot give the people too much money of their own earnings to spend. That would be inflationary, he says, but not a peep from the White House when wage increases are given time after time and time after time. Did the President say anything about the recent increase in wages to the miners? Did he say anything about all the other wage increases, all of which gave the people more money to spend and consequently must be inflationary? Wage increases are inflationary because they add to the price of the things we must buy. On the other hand, a tax reduction is not inflationary. It does not add to prices.

Now, let us examine this bill. You are going to hear a lot of demagoguery this afternoon about this being a tax bill for the rich as against the poor; but when you hear that statement bear in mind that 63 percent of the total reduction or \$2,571,000,000 goes to taxpayers with net incomes under \$5,000. This class represents over 96 percent of all taxpayers and under present law they only pay 56 percent of the total tax burden. Forty-four and one-tenth percent of the total reduction, or \$1,800,000,000, goes to taxpayers with net incomes of \$3,000 or less. Only 19 percent of the total reduction goes to taxpayers with incomes above \$25,000. These taxpayers pay 24 percent of the total tax under the present law.

You are going to hear a lot of pious talk—we have already heard some—about a motion to recommit. I am wondering how they are going to square their motion to recommit with what they say on the floor? According to the morning papers the motion to recommit will provide for increasing the exemptions of the individuals by either \$100 or \$200.

Let us see what this would do to the revenues. If you increase the exemption from \$500 to \$600 per capita the loss of revenue will be \$1,800,000,000 and the number of taxpayers removed from the rolls would be 4,200,000.

I am going to watch the roll call to see how consistent the preceding speakers will be. If you increase the exemption from \$500 to \$700 per capita the loss in revenue will be \$3,500,000,000 or almost enough to wipe out the increase proposed in the bill H. R. 3950. The number of taxpayers that will be removed from the rolls will be 9,700,000.

Now, if you give \$2,000 to married persons and \$1,000 to a single person, with a \$500 exemption for dependents, the number of taxpayers removed from the rolls will be 20,000,000 and the cost would be \$6,000,000,000.

Yes, I am going to watch that roll call. I am going to find out if you folks are sincere or whether you are just politicking. Income payments are now running at an annual rate of \$178,000,000,000. The revenue estimated for fiscal 1948 is based on income payments of only \$170,000,000,000; therefore our total receipt figures are conservative.

If we wait for a comprehensive tax study to be completed before we give individuals income tax relief, it would be

difficult to give such individuals tax relief at least until 1949. It is my guess that by 1949 we will have given so much money away to other countries that it might be out of the question to have tax reduction then. Let me say right here, my friends, that this may be the last opportunity in a long time that the American people will have for individual tax relief. There is no doubt about it at all, and I want you to remember that you have been warned.

Total receipts for fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, are estimated at \$41,400,000,000. With reductions proposed under H. R. 3950 the receipts will amount to about \$39,900,000,000, which is \$1,500,000,000 off for fiscal 1948.

H. R. 3950 is effective January 1 next instead of July 1 last. The effect of H. R. 1 on the receipts for the fiscal year 1948 was to reduce the revenue by approximately \$3,300,000,000. This bill will reduce the revenues for fiscal year 1948 by only \$1,500,000,000. Bear that in mind. Yet, some raise their hands, to high heaven in protest over giving the American people tax relief to the extent of \$1,500,000,000 during the last 6 months of this fiscal year. These same gentlemen voted to give the American corporations a \$5,238,000,000 lift in 1945.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not now.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman is all wrong in his figures.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is not wrong in his figures.

Mr. FORAND. He is wrong in his figures.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is not wrong.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Sit down; sit down. I do not propose to be diverted.

Mr. FORAND. Just tell the truth.

Mr. KNUTSON. I call the gentleman's attention to page 57 of the printed hearings on H. R. 1. Those are Secretary Snyder's figures.

The crying need is to give individual income-tax relief now. That is what the country is demanding. As I have already told you, the United Kingdom has had one tax reduction; Canada has had two. Yet we have not had any except the measly 5-percent reduction that was given in the Revenue Act of 1945, when we had a deficit of \$21,000,000,000. We gave the American taxpayers a reduction in the face of a \$21,000,000,000 deficit and gave the corporations almost \$6,000,000,000 relief in the face of a \$21,000,000,000 deficit. We are not going to let you forget it next year, either.

The minority speaks in one breath about inflation and in the other breath about recession. It takes more than a year for a tax bill to become fully operative, according to testimony given by Secretary Snyder before our committee. Therefore, if there is any danger of recession, it is important that we act now before the wolf is at the door.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am sorry, I have so little time I cannot yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. A few Democratic votes on this side might help you a little later.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman wants to put it on that basis, I will yield to him. I have always supported the gentleman regardless of the aisle, because he is usually right. I do not want him to run out on me today.

Here are some of the objections they are going to raise to this bill. They are going to tell you that a comprehensive tax study is now under way before the Committee on Ways and Means and should not be prejudiced by hasty income-tax action. The answer to that is, unless action is taken now, there will probably be no effective tax reduction until fiscal 1949, if then. The burdensomeness of the present income-tax rates and their stultifying effects on initiative and investment will not permit such delay.

Another objection that they will raise is that the expenditure requirements for the fiscal year 1948 are still very uncertain. The answer is, two appropriation bills which have already passed Congress embody substantial cuts. The Treasury-Post Office bill and the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency bill represent a cut of \$986,000,000 below the budget estimates. Savings resulting from the House action on the other bills total \$1,729,000,000. Therefore, at the present time it appears that the total savings on 1948 appropriations will be about two billion seven hundred millions. The reduction in expenditures will be substantially larger. In the President's budget it was indicated that 1948 appropriations would be about 86 percent of expenditures in that fiscal year. This percentage relationship means that a reduction of two billion seven hundred millions in appropriations is the equivalent of a cut of three billion one hundred millions in expenditures. A reduction of three billion one hundred millions in expenditures will leave a surplus in 1948 of seven billions. Since the collection loss resulting from the passage of H. R. 3950 is only one billion five hundred millions, a balance of \$5,500,000,000 will remain. This provides amply for debt retirement and any contingencies that may arise.

Another objection they are going to raise is that tax reduction now is inappropriate because the economic picture is not clear. The answer is, while there is no real evidence that a general business recession has begun, it is clear that the economy has leveled off. For the last 2 months there has been little change in either an upward or downward direction. Therefore, there is relatively little basis now for the fear of an inflationary spiral, which is basic to this objection to a tax reduction at the present time. Moreover, the great majority of business forecasters still expect that there will be some downward readjustment before the end of the calendar year 1947. The purchasing power which H. R. 3950 will begin to release on January 1, 1948, will be a good thing for the economy of the country, assuming that those who are forecasting a recession know what they are talking about.

It is high time that we reduced the penalties against investment and managerial

incentive imposed by the marginal rates under the individual income tax.

Here is another objection that they will probably raise. They will say that H. R. 3950 is not the right kind of a reduction because it gives the greatest relief to those who need it the least. The answer to that is that of the total reductions in tax liabilities of \$4,100,000,000 resulting from the passage of H. R. 3950, \$2,600,000,000, or 63 percent, goes to incomes of less than \$5,000, and \$1,800,000,000, or 44 percent, to incomes below \$3,000.

The greatest percentage of reduction in H. R. 3950 is 30 percent, which is received by persons with a surtax net income below \$1,000. Only those whose incomes are below \$1,040 receive more than 20 percent reduction. On the other hand, the tax on incomes between \$136,700 and \$302,400 is reduced by only 15 percent, and on incomes in excess of \$302,400 by only 10½ percent.

They will probably tell us that H. R. 3950 does not reduce taxes in the same proportion as they were increased during the period of 1939 to 1945. The answer to that is that this argument assumes that the rate structure in 1939 was ideal whereas it represented the end result of a determined share-the-wealth policy sponsored by the Roosevelt administration during the thirties.

Another objection that they will probably raise, and which would have no more substance than the others I have mentioned, is that the special exemption of \$500 for persons over 65 years of age is unwise. The answer to that is that this exemption recognizes the heavy concentration of small incomes in this age group and the inability of these people to adjust themselves to wartime changes in prices and taxes by accepting employment at the prevailing high rates of wages. This exemption will provide a logical basis for removing the exclusions now enjoyed by particular types of retirement income under existing law. A general exemption of this sort is preferable to a piecemeal extension of this system of special exclusions for the benefit of particular types of retirement income.

Now, I come to another objection which will probably be raised. A sound public policy requires the reduction of the public debt as rapidly as possible. Well, of course, we are all in agreement with that. We can have both debt and tax reduc-

tion under H. R. 3950. The application of the full amount of the surplus realized in the fiscal year 1948 to the debt retirement would be a dangerous practice. When the economy has leveled off and a downward turn is possible, a very large debt retirement concentrated in a short period of time may actually be the factor which precipitates the downward turn. In the short run, debt retirement reduces consumer income and is a deflationary factor.

Another objection that I can foresee is that the expenditure estimates now used involve an understatement because they fail to take into account additional outlays arising out of our international responsibility. I believe the gentleman from Virginia raised that point. The answer to that is, even after the enactment of H. R. 3950 at least \$5,400,000,000 will be available for debt retirement and contingencies in the fiscal year 1948 to meet all future drafts on the Treasury, foreign and domestic, it is necessary to maintain our economy on a sound basis through a sound tax system. I can conceive of no better way to maintain our country on a sound basis than to give the American taxpayers some relief from the tax load they are now carrying, which was imposed during the war.

When I was interrogated by the gentleman from Massachusetts he referred to the fact that the \$6,000,000,000 tax reduction that we gave corporations in 1945 was a war tax. Well, what would you call the present taxes which individuals are paying if they are not war taxes. If it was desirable to give relief to the corporations of America to the tune of nearly \$6,000,000,000 when we had a deficit of \$21,000,000,000, it stands to reason we should at least be willing to give the individual taxpayers of America tax relief to the tune of \$1,500,000,000 during the last 6 months of the present fiscal year when we will have a surplus in the Treasury that will amount to as much as \$5,400,000,000.

I have here a very interesting comparison of tax reductions provided by H. R. 3950 by net income classes, showing the percentage distribution of returns, the tax under the present law and tax reduction. I will insert this table and inasmuch as I do not have much time remaining I will reserve the balance of my time.

*Comparison of the tax reduction provided by H. R. 3950 by net income classes—percentage distribution of returns, tax under present law, and tax reduction*

[Income payments of \$170,000,000,000]

| Net income class          | Taxable returns |                  | Tax under present law |                  | Reduction provided by H. R. 3950 |                  |
|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|
|                           | Number          | Percent of total | Amount                | Percent of total | Amount                           | Percent of total |
| Zero to \$3,000.....      | 39,710,430      | 79.9             | \$6,479,000,000       | 36.5             | \$1,800,000,000                  | 44.1             |
| \$3,000 to \$5,000.....   | 8,012,673       | 16.2             | 3,520,000,000         | 19.8             | 772,000,000                      | 18.9             |
| Total under \$5,000.....  | 47,723,103      | 96.1             | 9,999,000,000         | 56.3             | 2,572,000,000                    | 63.0             |
| \$5,000 to \$10,000.....  | 1,265,839       | 2.5              | 1,453,000,000         | 8.2              | 307,000,000                      | 7.5              |
| \$10,000 to \$25,000..... | 530,578         | 1.1              | 2,125,000,000         | 12.0             | 428,000,000                      | 10.5             |
| \$25,000 and over.....    | 151,643         | .3               | 4,178,000,000         | 23.5             | 774,000,000                      | 19.0             |
| Total over \$5,000.....   | 1,948,060       | 3.9              | 7,756,000,000         | 43.7             | 1,509,000,000                    | 37.0             |
| Grand total.....          | 49,671,163      | 100.0            | 17,755,000,000        | 100.0            | 4,081,000,000                    | 100.0            |

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

CHART 3.—Numbers of days in 1947 that various classes of taxpayers must work for the Federal Government to pay their income taxes<sup>1</sup>

| Income of taxpayer (thousands): | Working days in year |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| \$0 to \$3.....                 | 17                   |
| \$3 to \$5.....                 | 36                   |
| \$5 to \$10.....                | 52                   |
| \$10 to \$25.....               | 81                   |
| \$25 to \$50.....               | 126                  |
| \$50 to \$250.....              | 176                  |
| \$250 and over.....             | 230                  |

<sup>1</sup>Based upon 300 working days in the year and upon the percent of the taxpayer's income going for Federal income taxes according to the estimates of the U. S. Treasury Department presented to the House Ways and Means Committee on Mar. 18, 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has consumed 28 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the subject of taxation has given me much concern since this Congress convened on January 1; not only much concern, but considerable study and some loss of sleep. It is a matter concerning which I know there is an honest difference of opinion, and to those who differ with me I accord perfect honesty of purpose and motive.

In the discussion of this important matter I feel we should approach it coolly, dispassionately, and keep our temperature and our blood pressure normal.

As a result of the study that has been given to the estimated Federal receipts and expenditures since the Eightieth Congress convened, I believe the time has now arrived when we can safely give the taxpayers of the United States some relief from the heavy burden of Federal taxation made necessary by World War II. I believe the time has arrived when we can do that in safety. To support that statement, I call as a witness and submit the testimony of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. John Snyder, in whose judgment and integrity, of course, we have confidence. I shall submit his statement before the Committee on Ways and Means on May 19, 1947, when we began the comprehensive study of the subject of taxation.

There has been considerable discussion here as to whether or not this is the time, or even whether the time is approaching when we should consider tax relief measures. If we are going to enact any tax relief measure for the calendar year 1948, I maintain this is not too early to begin. If we wait until January 1948 to take up the subject, it will take us weeks and probably months to get a bill out of our committee and

through the House. Then it would have to go to the other body, then to conference, and then to the President. As a result, any tax bill enacted at the next session of Congress after January 1, if it applied to the calendar year 1948, would have to be retroactive. So I repeat that if we are going to have tax relief for 1948, now is the time to begin. In substantiation of my belief that now is the time to approach the subject, I quote Secretary Snyder:

We are nearing lower peacetime levels of Government expenditures and continuing high levels of national income and production.

Both of which we know are true.

And he said:

A period of tax reduction is approaching.

What does that mean? Does that mean that we should not begin to consider the subject? It is approaching. A period of tax reduction is approaching. That is what the Secretary of the Treasury said. Surely he did not mean 1949. He must have meant not later than 1948. I assume that is a reasonable construction to place on his remarks. I do not believe the argument can be sustained that this is not the opportune time to begin to reduce the tax burden in view of the Secretary's statement. I believe the time has arrived, provided we do not make the effective date of this tax bill before January 1, 1948, and that is what is provided in this bill.

For reasons that I will summarize a little later I shall support the pending bill unless a more equitable bill is adopted by the House on a motion to recommit, which I understand will be offered. If it provides a better solution to the tax problem, if it is a more feasible bill, I shall support it; otherwise, if the motion to recommit is not adopted, then I shall support the pending bill; but I do not see how those who believe the time has not arrived for any tax reduction at all can support a motion to recommit providing for tax reduction. So it boils down to three things, whether we shall adopt the motion to recommit, pass the pending bill, or have no tax reduction at all. That is the issue before the House.

It should be borne in mind that this is not the first tax-reduction bill, and if enacted it will not be the first tax-reduction law since VJ-day in 1945. That should be kept in mind. Just a few weeks after VJ-day, our Committee on Ways and Means sat down with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Fred Vinson, and the members of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and devoted careful study in working out a tax-reduction bill. On October 9, 1945, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, by unanimous direction of that committee, I reported a bill that was passed overwhelmingly by the Congress and approved by the President on November 8, 1945.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I had no intention of criticizing the passage of the 1945 act. As a matter of fact, I supported it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes; the gentleman supported that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I supported it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. The minority Members, led by the distinguished gentleman who is now chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, cooperated fully in supporting the act unanimously.

Mr. KNUTSON. In the face of a \$21,-000,000,000 deficit I supported it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I have not the exact figures, but those are the facts.

I should like to point out that the preparation of the Revenue Act of 1945 was the result of the nonpartisan efforts of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, for in my opinion politics and tax legislation should not be mixed. Politics never writes good law of any kind.

Secretary Vinson recommended that we reduce taxes in the amount of \$5,000,000,000, or as near that figures as practical. As finally enacted, the Revenue Act of 1945 provided for a reduction for the calendar year 1946 of \$5,925,000,000. In this law substantial reductions were made in corporate taxes and individual income taxes, and some in excise taxes.

The reduction in corporate taxes for calendar year 1946 was estimated at \$3,140,000,000; individual income taxes were cut \$2,645,000,000, removing 12,000,000 taxpayers from the rolls; and excise taxes were reduced by \$140,000,000 by the repeal of the auto use tax. At the current levels of national income it is estimated that the annual revenue loss from the changes made by the Revenue Act of 1945 would total approximately \$9,000,000,000. So it is clear that our Republican friends, now in control of the Congress, do not have a monopoly on the willingness and desire to reduce taxes when it can be reasonably and safely done.

As is well known, I opposed H. R. 1 when it was originally before the House in March of this year. I did this for several reasons. First, for the reason that it was to become effective on January 1, 1947, and I do not believe in retroactive tax laws. Moreover, we did not know enough at that time about the fiscal picture for 1948 to safely enact a tax-reduction law. The President's budget message estimate the revenues for 1948 at \$38,900,000,000 and expenditures at \$37,500,000,000. So there was little margin of safety to insure even a balanced budget, not to mention debt retirement. I am happy to say that our fiscal prospects seem to be much brighter now. The net receipts under existing law are estimated by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for the fiscal year 1948 at approximately \$41,500,000,000. Even after enactment of the pending bill the 1948 receipts are estimated at nearly \$40,000,000,000, which will provide a surplus of \$5,000,000,000 for debt retirement, if the President's budget is reduced by only \$2,000,000,000. Even if the budget is not cut at

all, there is an estimated surplus of nearly \$2,500,000,000 for debt reduction.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman mean that if this bill becomes law that the estimated revenue for fiscal 1948 will be approximately \$40,000,000,000?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is correct. Then, if you do not trim the President's budget at all, that gives you \$2,500,000,000. If we trim the budget by \$2,500,000,000, you have four or five billion dollars as a conservative estimate to apply on the public debt. I believe that is an estimate on which we can rely, because the figures we have had for several months have been underestimated, and if the economic conditions are as the economists predict they will be, I would not be surprised if our revenue receipts were above \$40,000,000,000. All estimates are at best a guess. We do not know absolutely and definitely what our revenue receipts will be, but we do have a much better insight on the 1948 fiscal picture now than we had when H. R. 1 was before the House.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman consider the payment of two or two and one-half billion as adequate for the national debt on an annual basis?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Well, I would not consider it a negligible amount to be paid on the national debt, of course, but I do not consider that that is all that we can pay on it, because we certainly have reason to believe that the President's budget will be trimmed some. I do not think it will be reduced to amount to any four and one-half or six billion, as was estimated to begin with. But, from the evidence we have on the matter and from the most thorough and careful study I can make, it is safe to estimate that, if H. R. 3950 is enacted into law and becomes effective January 1, 1948, for the fiscal year 1948 we will be able to pay somewhere between three and five billion dollars on the national debt. I think that is a conservative estimate.

I made the statement, when the President's veto message was before the House, that I did not feel that I could support another general tax bill that did not provide for removing the inequity or injustice among taxpayers similarly situated in the community-property States and the non-community-property States. I introduced a bill to remove that inequity, and brought that matter up when this bill was reported out. It was stated that it was a very difficult proposition to draft. I called on the legislative counsel, Mr. Beaman, the highest authority we have in drafting tax legislation, to learn whether or not it would be practicable to try to embody that provision in this tax bill. He said he thought not, that it would take more time. Then our committee discussed the matter and we voted unanimously to begin now the consideration of this tax inequity that exists among married people in community-property States and non-community-property States, with a view toward working out and perfecting legislation

to equalize that injustice. The members of the committee pledged themselves that in the next tax-reduction bill we would include a provision removing that inequity.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It is also true that the committee has had before it many very intelligent witnesses dealing with that same subject.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is true. Of course, we do not want to bring out and have enacted into law a tax bill that is not workable. On the advice of the head of the legislative counsel, Mr. Beaman, on whom we all rely in drafting tax bills to make them legal and workable, we deferred consideration of the matter, with the unanimous understanding that the subject would be taken care of in the next tax bill.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. What would the community-property-tax legislation to which the gentleman refers entail in loss of revenue?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is estimated to be something less than a billion dollars. I do not know how much it would be. But even if tax rates have to be adjusted elsewhere, whatever it takes to remove that inequity and that injustice and place married people on a basis of equality, I shall favor.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman has had great experience in these matters. I should like to have him inform me what it would mean in loss of revenue if we removed excise taxes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman refers to wartime excise taxes?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not know exactly, but that is a matter for a general tax-revision bill.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will yield, my recollection is that if we remove the wartime increases of excise taxes it means not quite \$1,300,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. One and one-tenth billions, I understand.

Mr. CARROLL. On that basis, if we remove the wartime increases in excise-tax rates, coupled with the community-property-tax adjustment, we would have a loss of revenue of approximately \$3,000,000,000?

Mr. KNUTSON. That would be aside from the liquor and tobacco taxes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I should like to see some tax reduction effective January 1, 1948. If Federal taxes were all the American citizen had to pay, the load would not be so very heavy. But the total of State, county, and municipal taxes of various kinds, when added to present Federal-tax burdens, justifies the enactment of Federal income-tax reduction at this time. If the House rejects the motion to recommit that bill, the choice is between the tax reduction provided for in H. R. 3950 and no tax reduction at all. After careful consideration of the fiscal outlook for 1948, it is my opinion that some

tax reduction, although it may not be exactly the kind of reduction I should like, is justifiable, and can safely be made at this time. Then, in the comprehensive tax revision now under way in the Committee on Ways and Means, we can consider what adjustments should be made in corporate taxes, estate and gift taxes, excise taxes, and any further changes in individual income taxes that may at that time seem advisable. Since I believe that we can balance the budget and make a substantial payment on the public debt, I shall vote for tax reduction at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I am unable to agree with the majority of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means in their support of the pending bill, H. R. 3950.

The provisions of this bill are identical with those of H. R. 1 as it finally passed both Houses of Congress and which was vetoed by the President, except that H. R. 3950 is effective as of January 1, 1948, instead of July 1, 1947, as was provided in H. R. 1.

I spoke at some length while the bill, H. R. 1, was under consideration in the House on March 26, 1947, as appears at pages 2656 to 2658 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, and my views with respect to the pending bill are substantially the same as those expressed on that occasion.

I expressed the conviction then, just as I do now, that it is not yet time to reduce taxes, and that when the time does come it should be done on a much fairer and more equitable basis than is provided in this measure. As I pointed out on the previous occasion to which I have referred, it should be borne in mind that we have already given very important tax relief since the close of the recent war. The Revenue Act of 1945 reduced wartime taxes about \$9,000,000,000. It made major reductions in corporation taxes and reduced individual income taxes and made some minor reductions in excise taxes. Its main purpose was to ease the transition from wartime to a peacetime economy. This transition was made with far less decline in business activity than had been anticipated.

Any further tax reduction at this time to stimulate business activity cannot be justified. Business conditions are the best that we have ever known in the history of this Nation. In 1946, production reached the highest point in peacetime in our history, being 50 percent greater than the last peacetime year of 1939 and only 15 percent less than the highest point during the war.

Our national income amounted to about \$165,000,000,000 in 1946, and the estimates now are that it will run about \$10,000,000,000 more than that in 1947.

With these favorable conditions existing, it is certainly the proper time to give attention to our national debt.

The cost of World War II was an enormous sum. To hear some of the remarks made about the size of the na-

tional debt, one would think that some gentlemen had already forgotten that we had the most destructive and expensive war in all human history. This \$258,000,000,000 national debt was the price invested for the preservation of freedom and liberty in this country of ours, and you cannot estimate the value of freedom and liberty in dollars and cents.

From 1939 to 1946, our Federal expenditures amounted to more than \$400,000,000,000. We now have about 85,000,000 individual bondholders in this country. These people have the right to look to the Congress for the preservation of the soundness of the financial system of this country and to know that these bonds will continue to be sound and worth their face value to them. We are unable to know yet just what our fiscal situation will be. Only two of our annual appropriation bills have gone to the President. Considerably more than half of our annual appropriation bills are still pending in the Congress. Nobody knows at this point what they are going to finally amount to. I hope the reduction can be great—even greater than that regarding which some have expressed themselves before; but my guess is that when the final books are balanced, when the Secretary of the Treasury, the responsible official of this Government charged with the fiscal affairs of the Government, makes his report we will find very little actual reduction in the President's budget of \$37,500,000,000. You need only to look to yesterday when we passed legislation providing for the payment of the terminal-leave bonds for our men of the armed forces, estimated to cost from \$1,800,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000. Those are situations we must face. We know that these things are happening day after day. So it is time for us to try to be certain that we can afford a tax reduction before we rush in here for political expediency and provide a tax reduction before we know exactly what our budget situation will be.

With the disturbed and unsettled conditions of the world, we are still unable to know what our international requirements will be. Right now we know that attention is being focused upon the so-called Marshall plan, a plan presented by our great Secretary of State, which he thinks, and many of the leading thinkers of this Nation agree with him in the view, is necessary for the preservation of our system and our form of government to afford relief to other nations of the world, to help them prevent the spread of communism. Now, we know the figures have been given in the press that this program may amount to \$5,000,000,000 a year for a number of years in the future.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman will find the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs giving the most accurate figures to date, which reveals no such estimate at all. The estimates given there are from official sources, and will show that we could meet the obligations involved in the Marshall plan under a budget with this reduction, and that no such stratospheric

figure of \$6,000,000,000 a year is in contemplation.

Mr. COOPER. How much do you figure it is going to cost?

Mr. VORYS. Our studies showed that throughout this year it might run as high as \$1,500,000,000, but with accepted credits it would be down to \$800,000,000. For the next year, 1949, our studies showed that the total not already covered or expected to be covered would be \$7,000,000,000 for the 3 years.

Mr. COOPER. Are you going to be able to effectively prevent the spread of communism throughout the world on less than a billion dollars a year? My friend, I am afraid you are just not realistic.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I think the gentleman has made one of the most pertinent points that has been made so far. Where are we going with the Marshall plan? How can the Committee on Foreign Affairs know where they are going when the European countries themselves have not submitted their economic plan?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

I am sorry I will not have time to go further into the points I had expected to discuss, but I would like to refer in the 2 minutes I have to the motion to recommit, which I understand the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] will offer. It is similar to a plan that he offered in the committee; similar to a bill that was introduced by him, or at least a part of it in some respects.

While I take the position that now is not the time to reduce taxes until we know more definitely what our actual budget situation will be and what our foreign requirements will amount to, I hope if you are going to reduce taxes and you think that now is the time to do it, certainly a fairer and more equitable plan should be provided than that presented by the pending bill. This motion to recommit will cover just two points: One is an increase of the present exemption from \$500 to \$600, and the second is to reduce by 3 percentage points the present income-tax brackets. That will be estimated to lose about \$3,379,000,000 in revenue, but under this plan 80 percent of the relief would go to people with incomes of less than \$5,000, whereas under the pending bill only 62 percent will go to the people with less than \$5,000. So if tax reduction is to be provided I respectfully submit that the plan suggested in the motion to recommit to be offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island is much fairer and more equitable than that provided in the pending bill.

Bear in mind that under the pending bill you reduce in the high income-tax brackets the burden of taxes practically to the 1939 level, before the war. You do not do that for the small-income taxpayers. So this plan to be presented in the motion to recommit would be much

fairer if it is desirable to pass a tax-reduction bill at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with my prepared statement I do want to say to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNOTSON] that in the tax bill of 1945, which he criticized and to which he contributed so much toward its delinquency, that at the time of its passage we at least did strike from the tax rolls 12,000,000 of those who were most deserving in the lowest income-tax brackets.

Furthermore it was the gentleman himself and his Republican colleague who deserted my fellow conferee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and myself and brought about the retention of the high wartime excise taxes so vital to the consumers in order to give big wartime corporations bloated with war profits total and immediate relief from excess-profits taxes, about which he now complains.

Mr. Chairman, this is the wrong bill and the wrong time.

It is the same sickening mess containing all the favoritism toward the high-income groups and all of the discrimination against the millions of needy taxpayers in the low-income class. The rich taxpayers who constitute 1,948,000, or approximately 4 percent of the total, are to obtain 37 percent, or over one and one-half billions in tax relief. While the millions of small, needy taxpayers, numbering 47,723,000 and representing 96 percent of the whole, are to receive 63 percent of the relief, or roughly two and one-half billions. The reduction for the downtrodden rich, with incomes above \$300,000, will be about fifty-four millions, or relief per capita of \$57,000, while the well-to-do poor, with incomes under \$5,000, will receive an average of \$54 relief per capita, a difference of a mere \$6,946 per capita in favor of the rich.

To illustrate the inequity of this bill, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the take-home pay of the average American family of four with an income of \$2,500 would be increased by \$28.50. A similar family with an income of \$15,000—a Congressman's salary—will receive a take-home pay increase of \$727.70. The \$100,000 family of four will benefit by \$12,460.20. A family of four receiving a net income of \$500,000 will have \$58,175 more to spend, while the million-dollar family of four will have over \$100,000 to spend each year, from tax savings alone, on a new yacht and a new country home.

I am certain the President will again courageously veto this brazen attempt to betray the needy in favor of the greedy and his action, I predict, will again be sustained by the other body should we fail in our responsibility and our sense of fairness and good judgment. It is a strange phenomena how this legislative cadaver could ever be revived after a veto which for the first time in the history of the Congress, I believe, was sustained in connection with a tax bill. Yet, it is not strange at all if you make even a

superficial analysis of the benefits and ascertain who are to be the recipients of the lion's share of Republican generosity. The cohesive force of the plunderbund is determined to get theirs now. They fear that further study and delay till next January may alert the people and that this may be detrimental to their unjustified and selfish grab.

There are more important and pressing phases of Federal taxation than are here presented to you. The reduction of the public debt and of the attendant interest charges should be the first and most important move of the Congress. Mark you, for every billion dollars of debt unpaid this year, the taxpayer will be called upon to pay out roughly an additional \$20,000,000 in interest annually during the added or delayed redemption period. Putting it another way: For every hundred dollars paid on the public debt this year the taxpayer will save \$2 thereafter; in other words, he will reap deferred dividends by the prompt paying off of our obligation. Important, too, you will not be passing on to posterity a war debt which was not of their making. There is another facet to look at and, having called your attention to the fact, you will have a hard time justifying your desertion of the President and the great mass of needy taxpayers for the rich unless first you provide relief for married couples and for dependents. With the higher prices paid for food, clothing, and rents since the killing of price controls by the Republicans, immediate liberalization of exemptions assumes prime importance. It truly touches all taxpayers from the highest to the lowest bracket.

In any consideration of the tax problem we cannot overlook the importance of continued excessive excise taxes; they are repressive and burdensome. The wartime excises, highest in history, I believe, have served their purpose of providing added revenues needed in the defense of our country. They were effective in the control of inflation and of competitive buying of consumers goods, made scarce by wartime restrictions and conversion. To continue these indefinitely would violate a congressional pledge, inserted at my insistence and upon my motion in the committee report at the time of their enactment, that they would be repealed by Congress at the termination of hostilities or by proclamation of the President. The committee and the House acted in good faith to carry out the pledge when the tax reduction bill of 1945 was considered in this chamber. The abject submission to the Senate of the House conferees, excluding my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] and myself, inexcusable as it was, continued the levy until abolished by Presidential proclamation terminating hostilities, following which they were quickly and indefinitely reimposed by Congress to handicap business and to burden the consumer. If these discriminatory wartime super sales taxes levied upon a limited few items are not repealed soon, the Congress will be charged with violating its word and, moreover, for a possible recession brought about by a buyers strike of indignant consumers.

As a taxpayer, my stake in this iniquitous Knutson tax plan is perhaps greater

than that of the average citizen in my district, because I stand to benefit more and immediately. But my interest and responsibility as a legislator are clearly on the side of the average taxpayer who is neediest and represents the great bulk of our deserving people.

What deal is the Republican majority offering some of you Democrats for anticipated desertion of principle, party, and President? According to press reports you are being blackmailed to vote in reversal of your previous action, the failure of which will bring reprisal in the matter of presenting legislation on the FEPC, antilynching, and the poll tax. Particularly you men of the South are asked to stultify yourselves, to submit peacefully or stand the consequences. I resent these tactics as I know you do. No member of the House worthy of membership has ever shrunk from combat. Let us consider each bill and fight it out on the merits. Resist this attempt of blackmail which reflects adversely and particularly upon the Members from the South.

The Republican leadership has staked all on the repassage of the tax grab and every trick in the bag will be used to succeed. Important and pressing legislation bearing upon the Nation's security and the peoples' welfare will be jettisoned. Housing for veterans, desperately short and delayed by Republican opposition, will be junked. The demands of education as voiced by the leading educators of the country will be ignored, as will the pressing problems of health and welfare. No time for the consideration of any of these and a score more legislative problems, not even once; but for the tax grab, all the tactics, time and energy possible will be employed and repeated until success, they hope, will crown their efforts.

A well-known columnist, heretofore trustworthy, refers to the Knutson bill, H. R. 3950, as a Republican-Democratic move or action. Do not let anybody fool you. We, the members of the minority, had nothing to do with it. Not in the beginning or at the end, nor did the Republican members of the committee, for that matter. We were not treated as members of the Committee on Ways and Means, nor even as Democrats. We, the elected Representatives, were on the outside while unofficial outsiders functioning as the voice of organized wealth wrote the bill which, bearing the name of the present chairman, was presented to the committee and the Congress.

It was when first presented lopsided, premeditatedly, unfair, and unjust, doing violence to millions of small taxpayers but that is in accord with the philosophy of the Republicans who believe that, "Those who has gets and those who has not shall have it taken away from them."

Do not let the press releases of the chairman fool you; no concession has been made to the people, the President, or in committee. It is the same old tripe recipe with a new number and another date. It will be dumped by President Truman as it has been once before provided, however, that the other body is inclined to pass it again.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican controlled Committee on Ways and Means, and I mean, controlled, presents to you

for your consumption the same old tax mess which you could not stomach when once before it was returned from the White House. Sample it and see for yourself. It is the same rank recipe concocted by Chairman KNUTSON, as an untested election dish. The only difference is the change in the number assigned to the bill and its effective date. Instead of being known as H. R. 1, it is now known as H. R. 3950. Its effective date for the relief of the rich is by force of administration, opposition, and your previous action, postponed until January 1, 1948, instead as was originally intended, July 1, 1947. But it is the same old tax swill, less wholesome for the ageing. It is warmed over and relabeled to fool the Members of this House but it is no more palatable, no more wholesome than when you turned it down when it was returned to you cold by the President from the White House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, except for the change of the effective date, there is no difference between this bill which we are now considering and H. R. 1, which I heretofore opposed. The mere change of the effective date does not, in my opinion, render the bill more acceptable. As a matter of fact, during the intervening weeks since the passage of H. R. 1 circumstances have developed that, to my mind, make it even more apparent that this present bill, differing only from H. R. 1 in its effective date, should not pass.

I regret this move for a tax-reduction bill of this character at this time for I feel that this is a time when all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, should work together to place the country on a firm financial foundation, so that we might build for the future—whatever that future might hold. A few weeks ago I opposed H. R. 1 because at that time I stated that we were passing a tax bill reducing government revenues when we did not know what the expenses of operation of government for the fiscal year were going to be. There has been no change in the situation since that date, except for the fact that one appropriation bill has thus far reached the President's desk. When the House passed H. R. 1 it did so with the expectation that the promises that were made—I should not say "promises"—I should rather say "boasts"—that the President's budget would be cut by \$6,000,000,000 would be fulfilled. We have seen that these boasts have fallen short by at least 50 percent, even before the other body has undertaken to restore many of the cuts which the House Appropriations Committee felt were necessary. Not only that, but yesterday we passed the bill to cash the terminal-leave bonds, which involves an additional \$1,800,000,000 not even budgeted.

I understand it is estimated that \$100,000,000 will be necessary for the hoof-and-mouth-disease investigation and treatment, and that there is also a reported subsidy of \$85,000,000 for lead.

So today we stand in the same position insofar as our domestic appropriations are concerned as formerly, while insofar as our foreign commitments are

concerned our position is decidedly less favorable from a tax viewpoint. The situation overseas has developed to the extent that it must be apparent to all that the commitments of the United States must be far greater than originally anticipated when we thought that Russia would, in a straightforward way, aid in the reconstruction of Europe. We now know that the burden of reconstruction of Europe will not be shared by Russia; we now know that the obligations that the United States must assume will be greater than heretofore anticipated, because we relied, in good faith, upon Russia's cooperation in the rehabilitation of Europe.

I realize that the American people are most desirous of tax reduction. I know full well the pressure that has been brought by the business interests of the country to reduce taxes. Practically every industry has come before our committee urging that tax relief be given to their particular industry. With business at its highest peak; with the national income at its highest level and with unemployment at the minimum, we still hear the complaints of business that tax relief is needed in order to overcome the sales resistance of the public. There is no talk of a reduction of manufacturers' prices and in the face of the testimony, the conclusion is inescapable that the business interests of the country have come before our committee, not because taxes are so oppressive that they are killing the goose that laid the golden egg, but, rather, because they want to increase their corporate dividends over and above the record-making dividends of 1946 and the first quarter of 1947. I do not intend to go into a long discourse on taxes, except to point out this very salient feature, which should be borne in the minds of us who are passing on this tax legislation and that is, we do not know what our future commitments will be.

We are now fairly convinced that the economy drive, insofar as Government operation is concerned, cannot be reduced more than one or two billion dollars below the President's budget, and if we reduce the normal source of supply of money to operate the Government through income-tax reductions we must, if we are going to reduce the national debt, obtain the money from other sources. We are heading, under the present fiscal program of this Congress, toward a national excise or sales tax and that is just as certain as I am standing here. More than one of the present members of the Advisory Tax Council has already intimated that. If my recollection serves me correctly, our distinguished chairman has indicated the possibility of a broader base for excise taxes, or, in other words, sales taxes, as a sinking fund for the reduction of the national debt. Now what does that mean? It means that the stenographer, the laborer, the white-collar worker will pay by sales tax the same amount as those in the higher brackets pay in taxes for the ordinary necessities and comforts of daily life. That is a complete reversal and abandonment of the democratic principle that taxes should be levied against those who are best able to carry the burden.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not speak further, but I warn the Members of the House that this 20 percent tax reduction across the board is a forerunner of increased excise taxes or sales taxes, which must be borne by those in the lower brackets, so that even if you give them a 20 percent cut in their income taxes, they will more than make it up in the sales or excise taxes that they must pay. If we are to have a tax reduction effective January 1, 1948, then it is my firm conviction that that tax reduction should take the form of an increase in the personal exemption. I believe that relief should first be given to those in the lower brackets, so that they might more readily meet the increased cost of living that has resulted from the removal of food and rent controls. I am in accord with the motion that will be made to recommit for the reason that under the proposal that will be advanced by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] to increase the exemption from \$500 to \$600 per person and to reduce the tax by three points in each bracket, 80 percent of the benefit will go to those taxpayers having a taxable income of \$5,000 or less per annum, as against 62 percent of this class who will benefit under the Knutson bill. The proposal of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] gives relief where relief is most needed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, my position today is the same as it was when the original Knutson bill, H. R. 1, came before the House. I question seriously the wisdom of reducing taxes at this time. However, I feel that if this Congress is to reduce taxes, then the bill before us today, H. R. 3950, does not provide the proper distribution of the relief to be afforded.

Before I go into that phase of it, I want to take the time to make the correction that I sought to make for the benefit of the chairman of our committee. May I have the attention of the chairman of the committee, who refused to yield to me before?

The gentleman has repeatedly made the statement that the 1945 tax bill reduced corporation taxes \$6,000,000. Yet, when I tried to help him keep the record straight, he was kind enough to tell me to sit down. Well, I will not go that far with him, I will simply quote the figures for the record to show that the Revenue Act of 1945 reduced estimated tax liabilities for the calendar year 1946 by a total of \$5,925,000,000. Corporate tax liabilities were reduced by an estimated \$3,140,000,000; individual income taxes by \$2,645,000,000, and miscellaneous taxes by \$140,000,000.

These figures are taken from the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury next following the date of enactment of the Revenue Act of 1945.

This report covered the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, was submitted on January 10, 1947.

Now the \$6,000,000,000 figure to which the gentleman from Minnesota refers is something else entirely. He is talking about the amount by which corpo-

rate tax receipts would have exceeded receipts under present law, assuming a \$165,000,000 level of income payment to individuals, if the Revenue Act of 1945 had not been enacted.

Even under this assumption the gentleman from Minnesota is incorrect, for the exact figure in the case of corporations is \$5,238,000,000 according to Treasury estimates and not the \$6,000,000,000 to which the gentleman has referred.

The figures quoted from the hearings by the gentleman from Minnesota are based on a hypothetical case.

The 1945 bill also removed from the tax rolls 12,000,000 taxpayers in the lower income brackets.

I am opposed to H. R. 3950, Mr. Chairman, because I do not think it is fair that a married man who has an income of only \$1,200 a year should get relief of only 22 cents a week, while the man with a \$50,000 income would get relief to the tune of \$95.36 a week, and that the fortunate fellow with an income of \$200,000 gets relief to the tune of \$242.80 a week, as compared to the 22 cents a week for the \$1,200 individual.

Mr. Chairman, as was said before, I am going to offer a motion to recommit. It is a very simple motion, although when reduced to writing it may seem to be rather complicated. But reduced to plain, every-day English, all it will do will be to increase the exemptions on a per capita basis \$100, that is, from \$500 as under present law to \$600. Point number 2 is that it will reduce the surtax 3 percentage points in each bracket. That is all that it would do, but its effect would be altogether different from the effect of H. R. 3950. Under this proposal 80 percent of the relief would go to those in the income brackets of \$5,000 and under whereas under the Knutson proposal, namely, the bill H. R. 3950, only 62 percent would go to that group, which, to my mind, is the group that should get relief if relief is to be given.

In addition to that, a 3 percentage point reduction in the surtax brackets means that everybody, particularly those in the higher income brackets, will get fair and equitable treatment. In fact, it amounts to \$1,734,000,000 of relief for that group which is only 4 percent of the taxpayers. Bear in mind that in this country you have 96 percent of your taxpayers whose income is \$5,000 or less and only 4 percent whose income is above \$5,000. Yet, to that 4 percent will go \$1,734,000,000 under my proposal.

I think we are treating them mighty fair, and I sincerely hope those of you who are a little in doubt as to what you are going to do, those of you who want to be fair, will vote for the motion to recommit. If you do not do it, then you are just simply offering a sop to the low income taxpayer and giving the big taxpayer a windfall.

The following memorandum and tables set forth clearly the effect my proposal would have if enacted into law:

**PROPOSAL TO INCREASE INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS TO \$600 PER CAPITA AND TO REDUCE PRESENT LAW TENTATIVE SURTAX RATES BY 3 PERCENTAGE POINTS IN EACH BRACKET**

This memorandum compares a proposal to increase individual income-tax exemptions

to \$600 per capita and to reduce present law tentative surtax rates by 3 percentage points in each bracket with H. R. 3950, a bill introduced on June 24, 1947. H. R. 3950 is the same as H. R. 1, except that the effective date of the reductions is changed to January 1, 1948. The reductions under my proposal would also become effective January 1, 1948.

#### A. REVENUE LOSS

The increase in exemptions and reduction in surtax rates under my proposal would reduce individual income-tax liabilities by an estimated total of \$3,379,000,000, assuming income payments of \$166,000,000,000. This is \$425,000,000 less than the \$3,804,000,000 reduction under H. R. 3950 at the same level of income payments. (See tables 1 and 2.)

As compared with H. R. 3950, my proposal would distribute to low-income taxpayers both a larger dollar reduction and a larger proportion of the total tax reduction. Under H. R. 3950, \$2,372,000,000, or about 62 percent of the total tax reduction, would go to taxpayers with net incomes of less than \$5,000. Under my proposal, 80 percent of the total reduction, or \$2,689,000,000, would go to taxpayers with net incomes of less than \$5,000, of whom 4,700,000 would be removed from the tax rolls.

The tax reduction in the net income classes over \$5,000 under H. R. 3950 would amount to \$1,433,000,000, or about 38 percent of the total reduction. Under my proposal, these taxpayers would receive \$690,000,000, or 20 percent of the total.

#### B. ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS

##### 1. Increase in exemption

The present per capita exemption of \$500 was adopted in 1944. The amount to which a \$500 exemption would have to be increased to offset the effect of the price increases since 1944 has risen to over \$600. Thus, the \$100 increase would approximately adjust the level of exemptions for this price change.

Low exemptions are frequently urged to obtain a broad base in order to achieve wider tax consciousness and to preserve the revenue potentialities of the individual income-tax system. The four and seven-tenth million reduction in the number of taxpayers

under my proposal is not necessarily in conflict with the objectives of a broad base income tax, since forty-three and eight-tenths million taxpayers would remain on the rolls. Moreover, many low-income taxpayers are now on the tax rolls primarily because of inflationary conditions, even though the purchasing power of their incomes is no greater than in 1944.

The available family budget information and estimates of the relative amounts of income needed by single persons and families of different sizes to obtain the same general standard of living suggest that the per capita system of exemptions allows somewhat too much to dependents in comparison with the amount allowed single persons and married couples. The proposal would maintain the per capita exemption system and would not alter the exemption ratios as between single persons and families of different sizes. If the exemption increase is viewed merely as an adjustment for price changes, per capita exemptions may be preferred because they permit a greater simplification of the income tax than would other exemption ratios.

The increase in the per capita exemption from \$500 to \$600 would reduce individual income tax liabilities by an estimated \$1,646,000,000, assuming income payments of \$166,000,000,000. Of this amount, \$1,507,000,000, or 92 percent, would go to taxpayers with net incomes under \$5,000. (See table 2.)

##### 2. Reduction in surtax rates

This provision gives each taxpayer a reduction amounting to 2.85 percent of surtax net income.<sup>1</sup> The tax rate on the first \$2,000 of net income after personal exemptions would be reduced from 19 percent to 16.15 percent and the tax rate on net incomes after personal exemptions in excess of \$200,000 would be reduced from 86.45 percent to 83.6 percent. (See table 3.) The provision would also reduce the rates of tax proportionately more at the lower income levels than at the higher levels. For example, it amounts to a 15-percent reduction of the 19-percent bracket rate and a 3.3-percent reduction of the 86.45 percent bracket rate.

The estimated reduction in individual income-tax liabilities from this provision, after

taking into account the effect of the exemption increase, would be \$1,734,000,000, assuming income payments of \$166,000,000,000. Of this amount \$1,183,000,000, or 68 percent, would go to taxpayers with less than \$5,000 of net income. (See table 2.)

#### C. COMPARISON OF THE TAX REDUCTIONS UNDER THE PROPOSAL AND UNDER H. R. 3950 BY MARITAL AND DEPENDENCY STATUS

For single persons with no dependents, the proposal would give more tax reduction than H. R. 3950 below about \$1,070 of net income and less reduction above \$2,200. Between these levels, single persons would receive about the same reduction under the two plans.

Married persons with no dependents would benefit more from the proposal than from H. R. 3950 below \$4,290 of net income, although the reduction is only slightly higher under the proposal in the area between \$2,000 and \$4,290. Above \$4,290 they would receive a larger tax reduction under H. R. 3950.

The tax benefit from an increase in the per capita exemption becomes greater as the number of exemptions increases. Consequently, the proposal would give more tax reduction than H. R. 3950 over a greater portion of the income scale to persons with dependents than to those without dependents. For example, married persons with two dependents would benefit more from the proposal than from H. R. 3950 up to a net income of \$8,530, as compared with the corresponding levels of \$1,070 for single persons and \$4,290 for married persons without dependents.

A detailed comparison of the tax liabilities at specified levels of net income under the proposal and H. R. 3950 is given for married persons with two dependents in the attached tables 4 and 4a. The tax reductions under the proposal range from 100 percent at the lowest end of the income scale to 3.3 percent at the highest; under H. R. 3950, the tax reductions range from 30 percent to 10.5 percent. The changes in effective rates under the two plans are also substantially different. The decrease in present law effective rates under the proposal is approximately 3 percentage points for all levels of income; under H. R. 3950, the decrease ranges from 1 to over 11 percentage points.

TABLE 1.—Estimated number of taxable income recipients and their individual income tax liability, distributed by net income classes, under present law,<sup>1</sup> H. R. 3950,<sup>2</sup> and proposal to increase the per capita exemption to \$600 and reduce present law tentative rates by 3 percentage points in each bracket

[Assuming 1947 income payments of \$166,000,000,000]

| Net income classes (thousands) | Number of taxable income recipients |            |   | Total tax liability <sup>3</sup> |            |   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|---|----------------------------------|------------|---|
|                                | Present law                         | H. R. 3950 | \$600 per capita exemption and 3-percentage-point reduction in tentative surtax rates | Present law                      | H. R. 3950 | \$600 per capita exemption and 3-percentage-point reduction in tentative surtax rates |
|                                | Thousands                           | Thousands  | Thousands   | Millions                         | Millions   | Millions  |
| \$0 to \$1.....                | 6,352.3                             | 5,882.3    | 5,752.3   | \$299.5                          | \$304.3    | \$152.5   |
| \$1 to \$2.....                | 20,138.9                            | 19,718.9   | 17,549.8  | 2,839.6                          | 2,021.4    | 1,982.6   |
| \$2 to \$3.....                | 14,322.0                            | 14,217.0   | 12,930.2  | 3,692.3                          | 2,834.2    | 2,664.6   |
| \$3 to \$4.....                | 4,655.5                             | 4,655.5    | 4,620.3   | 1,827.7                          | 1,398.2    | 1,351.0   |
| \$4 to \$5.....                | 1,333.2                             | 1,333.2    | 1,321.3   | 775.9                            | 605.1      | 595.1   |
| Under \$5.....                 | 46,801.8                            | 45,806.9   | 42,074.0  | 9,435.0                          | 7,063.2    | 6,745.8   |
| \$5 to \$10.....               | 1,126.9                             | 1,126.9    | 1,126.9   | 1,318.0                          | 1,038.4    | 1,078.9   |
| \$10 to \$25.....              | 470.2                               | 470.2      | 470.2   | 1,874.4                          | 1,493.8    | 1,652.3   |
| \$25 to \$50.....              | 101.2                               | 101.2      | 101.2   | 1,435.5                          | 1,157.1    | 1,332.2   |
| \$50 to \$100.....             | 32.7                                | 32.7       | 32.7  | 1,183.6                          | 959.4      | 1,121.1   |
| \$100 to \$250.....            | 9.8                                 | 9.8        | 9.8   | 915.2                            | 752.2      | 878.7   |
| \$250 to \$500.....            | 1.3                                 | 1.3        | 1.3   | 328.9                            | 280.5      | 318.1   |
| \$500 to \$1,000.....          | .4                                  | .4         | .4  | 234.5                            | 205.5      | 227.2   |
| \$1,000 and over.....          | .2                                  | .2         | .2  | 276.2                            | 246.8      | 267.7   |
| Over \$5.....                  | 1,742.8                             | 1,742.8    | 1,742.8   | 7,566.3                          | 6,133.7    | 6,876.1   |
| Grand total.....               | 48,544.6                            | 47,549.7   | 43,816.7  | 17,001.3                         | 13,196.9   | 13,621.9  |

<sup>1</sup> Internal Revenue Code, as amended by the Revenue Act of 1945.

<sup>2</sup> A bill introduced on June 24, 1947 which is the same as H. R. 1, except that the effective date of the reductions is changed to Jan. 1, 1948.

<sup>3</sup> Includes normal tax, surtax, and alternative tax on net long-term capital gains.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Source: Treasury Department, July 7, 1947.

<sup>1</sup> The reduction in surtax rates under the proposal is made before the 5-percent reduc-

tion. Thus, while tentative tax rates are reduced by 3 percentage points the final re-

duction is 95 percent of 3 percentage points or 2.85 percent.



TABLE 4.—Comparison of amounts and effective rates of individual income tax under present law,<sup>1</sup> H. R. 3950, and proposals to increase the per capita exemption to \$600 and reduce present law tentative surtax rates by 3 percentage points in each bracket, for specified amounts of net income

[Married person 1—2 dependents]

| Net income before personal exemption | Amounts of tax |                         |   | Effective rates |                         |   |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------|-------------------------|---|
|                                      | Present law    | H. R. 3950 <sup>1</sup> | \$600 per capita exemption and 3-percentage-point reduction in tentative surtax rates | Present law     | H. R. 3950 <sup>2</sup> | \$600 per capita exemption and 3-percentage-point reduction in tentative surtax rates |
|                                      |                |                         |   | Percent         | Percent <sup>3</sup>    | Percent   |
| \$2,400.....                         | \$76           | \$53                    |   | 3.2             | 2.2                     |   |
| \$3,000.....                         | 190            | 133                     | \$97  | 6.3             | 4.4                     | 3.2   |
| \$4,000.....                         | 380            | 304                     | 258   | 9.5             | 7.6                     | 6.5   |
| \$5,000.....                         | 589            | 471                     | 431   | 11.8            | 9.4                     | 8.6   |
| \$6,000.....                         | 798            | 638                     | 612   | 13.3            | 10.6                    | 10.2  |
| \$8,000.....                         | 1,292          | 1,034                   | 1,034   | 16.2            | 12.9                    | 12.9  |
| \$10,000.....                        | 1,862          | 1,490                   | 1,531   | 18.6            | 14.9                    | 15.3  |
| \$15,000.....                        | 3,639          | 2,911                   | 3,116   | 24.3            | 19.4                    | 20.8  |
| \$20,000.....                        | 5,890          | 4,712                   | 5,198   | 29.5            | 23.6                    | 26.0  |
| \$25,000.....                        | 8,522          | 6,818                   | 7,653   | 34.1            | 27.3                    | 30.6  |
| \$30,000.....                        | 24,111         | 19,289                  | 22,481  | 48.2            | 38.6                    | 45.0  |
| \$35,000.....                        | 42,323         | 33,858                  | 39,946  | 56.4            | 45.1                    | 53.3  |
| \$100,000.....                       | 62,301         | 49,841                  | 59,189  | 62.3            | 49.8                    | 59.2  |
| \$250,000.....                       | 190,475        | 157,154                 | 183,073   | 76.2            | 62.9                    | 73.2  |
| \$500,000.....                       | 406,600        | 348,425                 | 392,073   | 81.3            | 69.7                    | 78.4  |
| \$750,000.....                       | 622,725        | 541,800                 | 601,073   | 83.0            | 72.2                    | 80.1  |
| \$1,000,000.....                     | 838,850        | 735,175                 | 810,073   | 83.9            | 73.5                    | 81.0  |
| \$5,000,000.....                     | 4,275,000      | 3,825,000               | 4,132,500   | 85.5            | 76.5                    | 82.7  |

way of persuasion to those who are getting ready to vote on this measure, by a continuance of this debate. However, I would like to comment briefly on some of the statements that have been made, and then to read to you from a very interesting table which I have, a table that has been prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

In the first place, we have heard several Members rise in opposition to this bill, to say that the only distinction between this bill and H. R. 1 is the effective date, next January 1. It should be pointed out that there is another differential. It will become very obvious to the gentlemen who oppose this measure when the final roll is called, and when those additional Members, who voted against H. R. 1, cast their votes for the pending measure, as they have announced they are about to do.

I think that is a distinction between H. R. 1 and the bill before us today that should not be overlooked. In fact, if it were not true, this bill would not be before us today.

We hear much said about the inequity of this bill or about the fact that it is the wrong kind of a bill. We hear talk about a fairer type of tax reduction. Those arguments are coming from the very same Members who 2 years ago on this floor supported a reduction of 5 percent straight across the board. We hear much about applying our savings on the Federal debt, and this, Mr. Chairman, coming from Members who have consistently failed to support us in our efforts to cut the Federal budget of \$37,500,000,000 so that there would be money to apply on the Federal debt. Member after Member comes to the well of the House and says, "We hope the reduction can be great," but still we get no support from them when an effort is made to cut these astounding figures that go to make up the Federal budget. Therein lies the inconsistency of those who oppose this bill. They say that now is not the time for tax reduction; it ought not to be done, but if you are going to do it we have a better idea of how to do it. There is but an ill-concealed attempt to scuttle all hope for tax relief. I trust that no Member of this House is being misled by this plan.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Not only have we received no help from some of these spenders but they have done everything possible to thwart our efforts.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Now, I want to protest that as being absolutely not in accord with the truth. We were never called upon to have anything to do with the writing of this bill.

We disavow it now. We had nothing to do with it to begin with and nothing to do with it in the end.

Mr. KNUTSON. We were talking about appropriations. Of course we did

not call the gentleman in because we knew he could not be helpful.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. And the gentleman from Michigan missed the point. We were talking about cutting the Federal budget and the cost of the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] said that we must be absolutely certain that we can afford tax reduction. But no such arguments were made by those who sponsored the tax-reduction bill of 1945 when, in the face of a deficit for the previous year of \$50,000,000,000 and in the face of an estimated deficit of \$20,000,000,000 for that year, they passed a tax-reduction bill that took \$6,000,000,000 from the revenues of Uncle Sam.

Those who oppose this bill say now is not the time to cut taxes. But 2 years ago in the face of an even greater national debt, and with huge annual deficits staring us in the face they, the Democratic Congress, supported the tax-reduction program of 1945 and it was signed by a Democratic President, a program to cut \$6,000,000,000 from the Federal revenues. The majority of this tax reduction at that time went to the corporations of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have here some tables prepared by the joint committee which will give to each of you the savings in individual income-tax payments that will be realized by the residents of your respective States when this bill, H. R. 3950, becomes the law of the land:

*Estimated reduction in individual income taxes for 1948, under H. R. 3950, by States*

[In thousands]

|                     |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| Alabama.....        | \$30,190 |
| Arizona.....        | 11,459   |
| Arkansas.....       | 14,235   |
| California.....     | 415,959  |
| Colorado.....       | 28,667   |
| Connecticut.....    | 76,538   |
| Delaware.....       | 25,276   |
| Florida.....        | 54,942   |
| Georgia.....        | 43,032   |
| Hawaii.....         | 18,716   |
| Idaho.....          | 9,161    |
| Illinois.....       | 335,902  |
| Indiana.....        | 72,298   |
| Iowa.....           | 40,876   |
| Kansas.....         | 35,621   |
| Kentucky.....       | 31,045   |
| Louisiana.....      | 36,834   |
| Maine.....          | 14,541   |
| Maryland.....       | 140,839  |
| Massachusetts.....  | 167,327  |
| Michigan.....       | 197,042  |
| Minnesota.....      | 62,362   |
| Mississippi.....    | 12,529   |
| Missouri.....       | 94,432   |
| Montana.....        | 8,928    |
| Nebraska.....       | 30,724   |
| Nevada.....         | 6,363    |
| New Hampshire.....  | 9,783    |
| New Jersey.....     | 139,887  |
| New Mexico.....     | 7,135    |
| New York.....       | 800,608  |
| North Carolina..... | 41,381   |
| North Dakota.....   | 7,549    |
| Ohio.....           | 227,513  |
| Oklahoma.....       | 31,474   |
| Oregon.....         | 38,991   |
| Pennsylvania.....   | 307,627  |

|                     |           |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Rhode Island.....   | \$25,086  |
| South Carolina..... | 17,381    |
| South Dakota.....   | 7,159     |
| Tennessee.....      | 39,382    |
| Texas.....          | 133,098   |
| Utah.....           | 10,658    |
| Vermont.....        | 5,177     |
| Virginia.....       | 46,555    |
| Washington.....     | 73,412    |
| West Virginia.....  | 21,690    |
| Wisconsin.....      | 69,495    |
| Wyoming.....        | 4,776     |
| Total.....          | 4,081,492 |

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to total.

Source: Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I have a table showing, by counties, the savings that will be forthcoming to the residents of my own State of Indiana, under this bill. That table follows:

*Estimated distribution by counties in the State of Indiana of 1 year's tax reduction provided for in H. R. 3950*

[In thousands]

| Counties:        | Tax reduction |
|------------------|---------------|
| Adams.....       | \$251         |
| Allen.....       | 4,498         |
| Bartholomew..... | 437           |
| Benton.....      | 184           |
| Blackford.....   | 269           |
| Boone.....       | 336           |
| Brown.....       | 55            |
| Carroll.....     | 202           |
| Cass.....        | 688           |
| Clark.....       | 381           |
| Clay.....        | 327           |
| Clinton.....     | 567           |
| Crawford.....    | 94            |
| Daviess.....     | 311           |
| Dearborn.....    | 336           |
| Decatur.....     | 259           |
| De Kalb.....     | 409           |
| Delaware.....    | 1,685         |
| Dubois.....      | 252           |
| Elkhart.....     | 1,534         |
| Fayette.....     | 336           |
| Floyd.....       | 566           |
| Fountain.....    | 278           |
| Franklin.....    | 144           |
| Fulton.....      | 261           |
| Gibson.....      | 369           |
| Grant.....       | 1,114         |
| Greene.....      | 382           |
| Hamilton.....    | 382           |
| Hancock.....     | 299           |
| Harrison.....    | 161           |
| Hendricks.....   | 256           |
| Henry.....       | 701           |
| Howard.....      | 951           |
| Huntington.....  | 563           |
| Jackson.....     | 386           |
| Jasper.....      | 195           |
| Jay.....         | 306           |
| Jefferson.....   | 270           |
| Jennings.....    | 136           |
| Johnson.....     | 323           |
| Knox.....        | 765           |
| Kosciusko.....   | 453           |
| Lagrange.....    | 171           |
| Lake.....        | 7,384         |
| La Porte.....    | 1,209         |
| Lawrence.....    | 466           |
| Madison.....     | 1,803         |
| Marion.....      | 15,879        |
| Marshall.....    | 460           |
| Martin.....      | 96            |
| Miami.....       | 505           |
| Monroe.....      | 585           |
| Montgomery.....  | 549           |
| Morgan.....      | 287           |
| Newton.....      | 161           |
| Noble.....       | 396           |
| Ohio.....        | 41            |
| Orange.....      | 195           |
| Owen.....        | 129           |

Estimated distribution by counties in the State of Indiana of 1 year's tax reduction provided for in H. R. 3950—Continued

| Counties:     | [In thousands] | Tax reduction |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Parke         | -----          | \$189         |
| Perry         | -----          | 153           |
| Pike          | -----          | 174           |
| Porter        | -----          | 504           |
| Posey         | -----          | 217           |
| Pulaski       | -----          | 161           |
| Putnam        | -----          | 308           |
| Randolph      | -----          | 440           |
| Ripley        | -----          | 253           |
| Rush          | -----          | 302           |
| St. Joseph    | -----          | 4, 178        |
| Scott         | -----          | 111           |
| Shelby        | -----          | 501           |
| Spencer       | -----          | 162           |
| Starke        | -----          | 170           |
| Steuben       | -----          | 261           |
| Sullivan      | -----          | 298           |
| Switzerland   | -----          | 82            |
| Tippecanoe    | -----          | 1, 399        |
| Tipton        | -----          | 218           |
| Union         | -----          | 96            |
| Vanderburgh   | -----          | 4, 230        |
| Vermillion    | -----          | 287           |
| Vigo          | -----          | 2, 306        |
| Wabash        | -----          | 507           |
| Warren        | -----          | 95            |
| Warrick       | -----          | 195           |
| Washington    | -----          | 147           |
| Wayne         | -----          | 1, 292        |
| Wells         | -----          | 241           |
| White         | -----          | 254           |
| Whitley       | -----          | 283           |
| Cities:       |                |               |
| Elkhart       | -----          | 785           |
| Goshen        | -----          | 341           |
| La Porte      | -----          | 421           |
| Michigan City | -----          | 594           |
| Mishawaka     | -----          | 542           |
| South Bend    | -----          | 2, 938        |

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to total.

Source: Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

That means, in each case, just that many more million dollars to be retained in your home communities, to be added to the family savings, or that will be spent with the merchants up and down your main street.

Comparatively speaking, Mr. Chairman, tax reduction is not inflationary, because it does not add to the selling price of commodities. On the other hand, however, these inflated governmental expenditures, these huge foreign loans and gifts about which we heard so much a few moments ago, all of which the President is constantly advocating and defending, do add to the cost of living and are definitely inflationary. It is not inflationary to let your fellow citizen in your home community have these added savings. He will handle them better and more wisely, I promise you, than will a swollen Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. Under the bill under discussion, H. R. 3950, will not the small taxpayer pay a smaller proportion of the national tax than he is now required to pay under the present tax law?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. The answer is definitely "Yes."

Mr. POTTS. Does it not mean, therefore, that those who vote against the bill want the small taxpayer to pay a larger portion of the tax?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. The gentleman is definitely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], speaking on the minority side, in his remarks said to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], chairman of the committee, that we did not have anything to do with the writing of this bill; and the answer of the gentleman from Minnesota was to the effect "We did not call you in because we knew you would not be helpful." I submit, Mr. Chairman, that is not a democratic process to be used in the framing of an important measure of this sort. It only indicates the attitude of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in attempting to force down the throats of the people an inequitable tax bill.

This bill is slightly soiled, slightly shopworn. It has been debated and debated. No sound reason has been advanced why it should be passed at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not find the people in my particular congressional district excited about getting a tax reduction. They do not ask too many questions about it. But there is one question in the public mind these days about which I receive many inquiries and which is worrying more than any other subject all of the people of this country. I am sure it is worrying all of the Members of Congress. I refer to the fight that is going on today between the two ideologies of communism and socialism on the one side and freedom-loving democracies on the other. The onward march of the totalitarian states, Mr. Chairman, can only be stopped in one of two ways. First, it can be stopped by war. It can be stopped by the democracies again going through the terrible years of suffering and agony we just went through in order to save us from totalitarian Nazi Germany. Or it can be stopped by a Government of the United States which is financially sound and economically strong, cooperating and working with other freedom-loving peoples and nations. Collapse of our prosperous economy would undoubtedly be a boon to communism. We must remain financially strong, for that is the only way we can defeat the march of totalitarianism, Mr. Chairman, and if we do not have a sound economy in America and a sound financial Government then we have not much hope for the future. So I say, Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to reduce taxes. This is the time to pay up on our national debt, thus making our Government economically stronger and financially sounder.

What are we doing now? We are helping those people and those nations who want to remain free and independent.

To give the small tax relief to the people of this country provided in this bill, which will not do them much good, and thus weaken our Government, will

endanger our freedom and our liberty for the future. It is certainly not the proper thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members of the Republican Party will follow the policy that they have always followed of preaching and practicing a sound, strong, financial economy; and that they will not, for purely partisan purposes, pass this little tax relief bill which is inequitable in the mind of any man who approaches it with a fair, open viewpoint to see where it gives the most tax relief. This is important. I hope when the final vote comes that those who want a sound economy, those who are so much afraid of communism, anarchy, confusion, and chaos will vote on final passage against this iniquitous, inequitable, unfair measure of tax relief.

There are other reasons for not enacting H. R. 3950, Mr. Chairman. The prospect for a substantial cut in appropriations, if anything, is worse than when H. R. 1 was originally considered by the House. The failure to make substantial cuts in the President's budget, combined with necessary appropriations not included in our budget, and with prospective international commitments which will materialize in fiscal year 1948, have greatly dimmed my hopes for any substantial surplus in the current fiscal year. If there is any doubt that the budgetary picture will not permit both tax reduction and substantial debt retirement in 1948, the people have indicated that they do not want tax reduction at the expense of debt retirement. According to the most recent Gallup poll, only 38 percent of the people would give priority to tax reduction over debt retirement. I again repeat my charge that the Republican plan is to substitute sales taxes to replace the revenue lost by H. R. 3950. On more than a dozen occasions since the Knutson tax bill was passed by the House, the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means have raised the prospect of finding new sources of revenue—new excise or sales taxes—through shifting much of the burden that is now being carried by the income-tax group to the excises. Now, if the Republicans wish to run on a program of a Federal sales tax in 1948, I shall be delighted, for that will insure a healthy Democratic majority in the Congress. And last, even if the Republican plan were not to replace the income-tax reduction provided by this bill with sales taxes falling most heavily upon the low-income group, H. R. 3950 discriminates against taxpayers in the lower brackets. Mr. Chairman, I think the working people of my district and my State will know what the Republican Party stands for when they learn that the \$300,000 man is given an increase in take-home pay, after taxes, of more than 60 percent, while the man under \$5,000 receives less than a 5-percent increase in take-home pay. Or to put it another way, the increase in take-home pay of the individuals under \$5,000 averages around 4 cents an hour, while the \$300,000 man would receive a windfall of \$19 an hour increase in take-home pay. I think even those Members of

the House who have already decided to vote for this bill should realize that this \$19 an hour increase in take-home pay is voted by them to less than 1,500

taxpayers in the country, while the other 49,000,000 taxpayers must assume their burden of eventual retirement of the war debt if H. R. 1 should become law.

Mr. Chairman, I insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of taxpayers, by State and size of net income:

Number of taxpayers, by State and by size of net income  
[Estimates for 1947 based on 1943 distribution, by State and classes]

| States and Territories                | Total      | Under \$5,000 | \$5,000, under \$10,000 | \$10,000, under \$25,000 | \$25,000, under \$50,000 | \$50,000, under \$100,000 | \$100,000, under \$300,000 | \$300,000 and over |
|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Alabama.....                       | 585,959    | 570,982       | 9,128                   | 4,420                    | 992                      | 347                       | 84                         | 6                  |
| 2. Alaska.....                        |            |               |                         |                          |                          |                           |                            |                    |
| 3. Arizona.....                       | 183,021    | 177,847       | 3,043                   | 1,693                    | 304                      | 111                       | 19                         | 4                  |
| 4. Arkansas.....                      | 284,386    | 276,131       | 4,958                   | 2,586                    | 516                      | 147                       | 48                         |                    |
| 5. California.....                    | 993,181    | 833,067       | 99,843                  | 46,127                   | 9,918                    | 2,201                     | 937                        | 88                 |
| 6. Colorado.....                      | 375,413    | 360,374       | 9,691                   | 4,279                    | 759                      | 216                       | 78                         | 16                 |
| 7. Connecticut.....                   | 899,863    | 856,473       | 29,525                  | 10,438                   | 2,317                    | 814                       | 250                        | 46                 |
| 8. Delaware.....                      | 108,715    | 102,964       | 3,493                   | 1,599                    | 364                      | 167                       | 90                         | 38                 |
| 9. District of Columbia.....          | 392,731    | 374,414       | 12,283                  | 4,514                    | 1,083                    | 327                       | 102                        | 8                  |
| 10. Florida.....                      | 612,074    | 585,023       | 16,115                  | 8,229                    | 1,892                    | 582                       | 191                        | 42                 |
| 11. Georgia.....                      | 686,480    | 664,686       | 12,959                  | 6,771                    | 1,538                    | 464                       | 152                        | 10                 |
| 12. Hawaii.....                       | 173,100    | 163,806       | 6,536                   | 2,022                    | 606                      | 186                       | 40                         | 4                  |
| 13. Idaho.....                        | 173,059    | 168,486       | 3,155                   | 1,223                    | 152                      | 33                        | 10                         |                    |
| 14. Illinois.....                     | 3,448,219  | 3,308,887     | 80,250                  | 37,992                   | 8,400                    | 2,757                     | 809                        | 124                |
| 15. Indiana.....                      | 1,323,532  | 1,287,050     | 24,792                  | 9,216                    | 1,771                    | 520                       | 163                        | 20                 |
| 16. Iowa.....                         | 831,633    | 800,311       | 23,890                  | 6,301                    | 891                      | 239                       | 41                         | 10                 |
| 17. Kansas.....                       | 584,081    | 566,302       | 14,199                  | 5,360                    | 830                      | 213                       | 71                         | 6                  |
| 18. Kentucky.....                     | 603,559    | 589,703       | 8,564                   | 4,138                    | 810                      | 249                       | 75                         | 20                 |
| 19. Louisiana.....                    | 611,760    | 594,383       | 10,593                  | 5,266                    | 1,032                    | 363                       | 115                        | 8                  |
| 20. Maine.....                        | 293,867    | 285,491       | 5,635                   | 2,304                    | 405                      | 101                       | 29                         | 2                  |
| 21. Maryland.....                     | 937,258    | 898,595       | 26,595                  | 9,216                    | 1,953                    | 667                       | 206                        | 26                 |
| 22. Massachusetts.....                | 1,921,114  | 1,853,351     | 42,710                  | 19,090                   | 4,271                    | 1,308                     | 358                        | 26                 |
| 23. Michigan.....                     | 2,275,038  | 2,166,923     | 78,432                  | 22,570                   | 4,777                    | 1,691                     | 583                        | 62                 |
| 24. Minnesota.....                    | 972,421    | 945,396       | 18,481                  | 6,677                    | 1,346                    | 402                       | 119                        |                    |
| 25. Mississippi.....                  | 247,968    | 238,689       | 5,409                   | 3,150                    | 597                      | 108                       | 35                         |                    |
| 26. Missouri.....                     | 1,234,444  | 1,198,126     | 22,200                  | 10,956                   | 2,429                    | 716                       | 193                        | 24                 |
| 27. Montana.....                      | 780,120    | 773,167       | 5,071                   | 1,646                    | 192                      | 29                        | 11                         | 4                  |
| 28. Nebraska.....                     | 437,206    | 421,216       | 11,156                  | 3,997                    | 658                      | 150                       | 25                         | 4                  |
| 29. Nevada.....                       | 77,132     | 74,883        | 1,352                   | 658                      | 152                      | 59                        | 22                         | 6                  |
| 30. New Hampshire.....                | 186,615    | 182,527       | 2,705                   | 1,081                    | 213                      | 69                        | 20                         |                    |
| 31. New Jersey.....                   | 1,925,792  | 1,848,671     | 51,950                  | 19,795                   | 3,755                    | 1,210                     | 377                        | 34                 |
| 32. New Mexico.....                   | 115,764    | 112,324       | 2,141                   | 1,081                    | 152                      | 52                        | 12                         | 2                  |
| 33. New York.....                     | 5,867,636  | 5,611,536     | 155,963                 | 73,287                   | 18,065                   | 6,269                     | 2,183                      | 333                |
| 34. North Carolina.....               | 747,443    | 730,108       | 10,255                  | 5,360                    | 1,194                    | 379                       | 119                        | 28                 |
| 35. North Dakota.....                 | 174,318    | 168,486       | 4,508                   | 1,176                    | 132                      | 13                        | 3                          |                    |
| 36. Ohio.....                         | 2,599,262  | 2,492,351     | 72,685                  | 26,237                   | 5,576                    | 1,763                     | 564                        | 86                 |
| 37. Oklahoma.....                     | 510,408    | 496,069       | 9,353                   | 3,903                    | 708                      | 268                       | 71                         | 6                  |
| 38. Oregon.....                       | 513,446    | 491,419       | 14,312                  | 5,925                    | 1,245                    | 402                       | 131                        | 12                 |
| 39. Pennsylvania.....                 | 3,684,045  | 3,570,577     | 71,445                  | 30,563                   | 7,448                    | 2,636                     | 840                        | 136                |
| 40. Rhode Island.....                 | 318,807    | 308,892       | 4,973                   | 2,828                    | 729                      | 239                       | 102                        | 4                  |
| 41. South Carolina.....               | 373,120    | 365,054       | 5,071                   | 2,353                    | 425                      | 134                       | 38                         |                    |
| 42. South Dakota.....                 | 149,450    | 145,086       | 3,268                   | 940                      | 121                      | 29                        | 6                          |                    |
| 43. Tennessee.....                    | 687,849    | 669,266       | 11,269                  | 5,501                    | 1,235                    | 435                       | 125                        | 18                 |
| 44. Texas.....                        | 1,919,647  | 1,862,712     | 33,356                  | 18,009                   | 3,886                    | 1,167                     | 413                        | 104                |
| 45. Utah.....                         | 211,434    | 205,928       | 3,006                   | 1,505                    | 304                      | 72                        | 19                         |                    |
| 46. Vermont.....                      | 100,780    | 98,284        | 1,690                   | 658                      | 101                      | 29                        | 18                         |                    |
| 47. Virginia.....                     | 792,888    | 767,550       | 16,565                  | 6,771                    | 1,225                    | 350                       | 115                        | 12                 |
| 48. Washington (includes Alaska)..... | 1,046,793  | 1,015,599     | 20,397                  | 8,511                    | 1,639                    | 491                       | 144                        | 12                 |
| 49. West Virginia.....                | 497,180    | 486,739       | 6,874                   | 2,868                    | 546                      | 121                       | 32                         |                    |
| 50. Wisconsin.....                    | 1,183,854  | 1,151,324     | 22,087                  | 8,464                    | 1,488                    | 383                       | 100                        | 8                  |
| 51. Wyoming.....                      | 87,669     | 84,243        | 2,366                   | 893                      | 132                      | 23                        | 10                         | 2                  |
| Total.....                            | 48,544,504 | 46,801,801    | 1,126,897               | 470,202                  | 101,204                  | 32,701                    | 10,298                     | 1,401              |
|                                       | 48,544.6   | 46,801.8      | 1,126.9                 | 470.2                    | 101.2                    | 32.7                      | 10.3                       | 1.4                |

This table shows that in the State of Pennsylvania only 136 taxpayers would receive this maximum increase in take-home pay of 60 percent or more, while 3,000,684 residents of the Keystone State would receive an increase in take-home pay of less than 5 percent. In Michigan 62 taxpayers would receive the \$19 an hour increase in take-home pay, while 2,275,000 taxpayers would receive 4 cents an hour increase in take-home pay. The same disproportionate benefits are provided for all residents of all the States, and enactment of this bill amounts to a vote of special privilege for these few 1,500 taxpayers at the expense of the other 49,000,000. In this connection I need not point out that most of the millions of young people who fought the war are largely in the bracket under \$5,000 where the tax reduction is so small and where the increase in wartime tax rates fell so heavily.

My final question, Mr. Chairman, is whether these veterans who fought the war now must come home to pay, not only their share of the financial cut in this \$257,000,000,000 national debt but the share of the upper-bracket taxpayers as well. That is precisely what will happen if H. R. 3950 becomes law.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

TAX BILL WILL BE AN ADDITIONAL EXPENSE—NOT A SAVING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill if enacted into law will cost about \$4,000,000,000, and that has been pictured as a saving. Let us see if it will be a saving.

During the history of this Nation, on long-term bonds, we have paid as much in interest as we have paid on the principal. In other words, for every \$1 of principal we have paid \$1 of interest or \$2 for every \$1. With the national debt as large as it is, it is reasonable to assume that in the future we will pay \$2 or possibly \$3 in interest for every \$1 of principal; therefore, the \$4,000,000,000 which has been pictured as a saving may turn out to be an expense of \$8,000,000,000 or \$12,000,000,000 before it is paid. For every dollar we pay on the national debt today we save the taxpayers from \$3 to \$4.

So, why do you say it is a saving? It is a tremendous and an enormous expense in the long run. Now, while we are reducing taxes we are increasing the interest rate. May I invite your attention

to the fact that 1 year ago the going rate of interest on Government obligations was 1.996 percent. Today the going rate of interest is 2.10 percent. The difference is that today the cost of servicing our national debt, paying the interest on it, is \$138,000,000 more this year than it was 1 year ago. That means an increase of \$775,000 a day just in interest alone.

The Federal Reserve Board has recently issued an order which will be effective day after tomorrow, July 10, and the effect of it is to unpeg the three-eighths percent bills, which means that instead of the Government getting money for three-eighths of 1 percent the Government will pay up to maybe three-fourths of 1 percent on those bills. That will also enormously increase the interest charges on the national debt. It does not hardly make sense to me, just talking for myself. I am not attempting to speak for any other person, but it hardly makes sense to me to be causing the interest rates to go up and the cost of carrying the national debt higher and higher and higher all the time, and yet reduce taxes.

How much should we pay on this national debt? Certainly we should pay six or seven billion dollars a year, if we can. We should amortize it possibly over

a period of 40 years and pay six or seven billion dollars a year. As long as we have this tremendous debt, which it held largely by commercial banks which created the money by a bookkeeping transaction to buy the bonds, we are in danger of ruinous inflation, so the quicker we get rid of this debt the better off we will be.

NATIONAL DEBT REPRESENTS LIVES OF 3,000,000 MEN

Now, this debt is approximately \$258,000,000,000. Why do we owe that much money? I will tell you why we owe it. It represents the lives of millions of American boys who are back here safely now, who probably would not be back here were it not for this national debt. Our Government adopted the policy, and it was adopted by Members on both sides of the aisle, when this war started that manpower was worth more than money; that we would not send a man into a place of danger against an enemy if a machine could be sent there instead, regardless of the cost of that machine. We used money instead of men. We used money to buy food and ammunition and equipment and supplies and arms for the purpose of placing these vital essentials of war into the hands of our allies, and our allies took our ammunition and destroyed our common enemy, thereby saving the lives of American boys. Considering the heavy casualty list of the different countries of the world, it is reasonable to assume that our policy in creating this debt and using money instead of men has saved the lives of 3,000,000, at least, American boys, and we should be glad to pay it, and pay it off as quickly as possible.

[From the Wall Street Journal of July 2, 1947]  
TREASURY CONSIDERING INCREASE IN INTEREST RATE ON 90-DAY BILLS FROM PRESENT THREE-EIGHTHS PERCENT—MAY BE FIRST STEP TOWARD HIGHER LEVEL OF INTEREST RATES GENERALLY

WASHINGTON.—There are growing indications in Washington that the Treasury soon may be willing to pay higher interest on its shortest term borrowings.

At the moment the Treasury has about \$16,000,000,000 of 90-day bills outstanding. These carry interest at an annual rate of three-eighths percent. The rate on these 3-months' bills has been pegged at this level since the beginning of the war. The pegging is done by the Federal Reserve System which stands ready to buy all such bills at a price to maintain the three-eighths percent rate; it now owns more than \$14,000,000,000 of them. It also will resell these bills so that the buyer gets three-eighths percent. The bills are sold by the Treasury with that understanding.

That's contrary to normal free money market practice, in which bill rates would be allowed to fluctuate in accordance with the supply and demand for money. Now it appears likely that a free market in the case of Treasury bills will be restored.

There has also been some talk in Washington that the pegging of Treasury certificates, which have a maturity of 1 year and carry a seven-eighths percent interest rate, might be abandoned. But this, it is believed, would happen some time after the bill rate was freed. Although there is no formal arrangement covering the pegging of the certificates at this rate, the Federal Reserve System has since the beginning of

the war bought and sold these certificates in a way to support the seven-eighths percent rate. About \$26,000,000,000 of certificates are outstanding.

High Treasury and Federal Reserve officials have had the subject of unpegging the bill rate under discussion this week. It has been talked about many times before, but previously the Treasury has been hostile to any change. Now, however, the Treasury seems more receptive to the idea that interest rates on short-term securities should be permitted to rise.

In some quarters it is suggested that freedom of the Treasury bill rate might be the first step toward a higher level of interest rates generally.

One group of Federal financiers, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, has favored a rise in interest rates for some time. Their theory: If a borrower has to pay more for his money, he will tend to borrow less. That, they suggest, will help curb inflation.

The Treasury, on the other hand, has argued that the Government is paying out about \$5,000,000,000 yearly in interest on the national debt and that any rise in interest rates would just add to the cost of servicing that debt. Lately, however, with a GOP-sponsored trend toward economy in fiscal affairs Treasury officials have come to the conclusion that interest rates perhaps can be permitted to firm somewhat.

If short-term rates were unleashed, nobody knows how high they'd go, but experts say bills might jump five-eighths percent or three-fourths percent and certificates to 1 percent or even 1½ percent.

What will happen if and when the interest rate peg is pulled? Probably nothing the workman can point to. Maybe nothing that will affect him for some time. If higher interest rates on some Treasury securities should bring about a tightening of credit available to business and individuals, it would be a gradual process.

#### MEANS SOMETHING, TOO

Unpegged rates would mean something tangible, however, to institutional investors such as banks, universities and insurance companies. The great bulk of the Treasury bills not in the hands of the Federal Reserve System are held by commercial banks and insurance companies. Occasionally some big corporations with funds available for short-term investment buy these bills.

In normal times when money markets are free Treasury bills are sometimes subject to wide fluctuations depending on how much or how little banks have available to invest in these short-term obligations.

Since the war ended and the Government's urgent need to borrow subsided, insurance companies have been insisting the Treasury unpeg rates. Actually, all Federal interest rates are pegged now. These pegs were inserted as the war got under way to keep down the cost of financing the war.

Insurance executives argue the Government doesn't need this protection any more, and it is injuring the insurance business. They say many kinds of life insurance policies commit the insurance company to pay a fixed interest rate, frequently 3 percent, on premiums left to accumulate with the company. Obviously, to break even on this deal, the company must invest this money to make at least 3 percent.

#### INVESTMENTS LIMITED

Nowadays, insurance executives complain, that is impossible. In the first place, they say, most States limit insurance company investments to only the highest grade securities, such as Government and municipal bonds and a few industrial preferred stocks. These "blue chips" seldom pay as high returns as riskier investments. Even the long-

term "Governments" designed for institutional investors yield less than 2.5 percent. Few industrial preferred stocks pay more than 4 percent to make matters still worse for the insurance firms, there aren't enough long-term Government securities to go around.

Insurance companies want the Government to issue more long-term (5 to 20 years) securities at higher than present rates. But until then, they'll be happy if it will raise interest rates on short-term securities. When that happens, they think banks may be willing to buy and hold more of these short-term securities which suit their investment requirements and reduce their holdings of long-term Governments, which fit insurance company requirements.

#### WHAT INSURANCE FIRMS SAY

The insurance firms bewail the fact that banks have been buying all long-term securities they could lay their hands on and letting the Federal Reserve banks sweep up the short-term stuff they don't want.

Banks and insurance companies share their complaints with other institutional investors, like universities and hospitals which rely largely on endowment income to keep operations going.

These long-term investors argue that when the Treasury pays little for the use of borrowed money, other people do the same thing. If the Treasury only offers, say 2½ percent, a business corporation doesn't have to offer 5 percent to attract investors. It can attract them at 4 percent or even less. That policy in part explains the wave of corporate re-financing at low rates which has been evident during and just after the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

MR. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

MR. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest, as I always do, to my colleagues who are speaking on either side of the question. I know this, from rather long experience in this House, that down deep in the heart of every man who casts his vote there is the thought that he wants to do that which he thinks is best for his country. That is the feeling that I am sure possesses every man on the floor of this House.

The only way I can judge the future as far as I am concerned is from experiences I have had in the past. I recall very vividly, because I was here, the debates when it was sought to reduce taxes after the first World War. I recall very well what the \$26,000,000,000 debt then meant to the people of this country. They questioned very seriously whether they could pay that debt in the course of many, many years.

Our party came into power after the first World War, and we had all of the problems that follow wars such as the last one and the recent one. I recall conditions at that time. About 7,000,000 people were idle. There was not a stream of smoke coming from the smoke-stack of an industry in this country. Even in a town as small as the one I live in the citizens organized soup kitchens to take care of people who ordinarily had jobs in our factories. It seemed like a very unusual thing under those conditions to talk about reducing taxes, but it was the judgment of the best minds of

the time that it ought to be done. It was the judgment of the best minds of that day in the Government, and I think I can truthfully say that it was true of the leading minds in both parties, that there would have to be retrenchment, and very severe retrenchment. So we started in exactly as we are doing now to cut the expenses of government.

We did lower the taxes, and what was the result? It gave an impetus to industry. Money was released for venture capital, new industries sprang up, men were employed. Inside of a year 7,000,000 men were employed at good wages. Smoke was belching from every chimney of every factory in this country. Farmers were prosperous. Things were just going fine and continued to do so for more than 10 years.

What about the payment on the national debt? One billion dollars was paid on the national debt, even though we reduced taxes. It was not long before we reduced taxes again. Prosperity was still greater. We paid another billion on the national debt, and we paid \$1,000,000,000 on the national debt each year for 10 years.

They say our people are employed. Yes, factories are busy in this country, but what we need is this. The GI's who are in our colleges are crowded into temporary huts, they are living in trailers, they do not have houses to live in, but they are there determined to get an education. They have dreams that are going to make this country great, if you give them the opportunity. But you are strangling future industry with the taxes we are carrying now. The high rate was 50 percent after the First World War, but here we are exacting 90 percent, almost confiscation.

I have here a report from the Treasury. A person earning up to \$3,000 has to work 17 days to pay his Federal income tax. That does not include the State taxes. From \$3,000 to \$5,000 he has to work 36 days. From \$5,000 to \$10,000 he works 52 days, \$10,000 to \$25,000 81 days, \$25,000 to \$50,000 126 days, and so on down until some work as high as 230 days to pay their Federal taxes. These figures are based on 300 working days in 1947. This bill provides for an additional exemption of \$500 for each person who attains the age of 65 before the end of the taxable year 1948. The exemption will benefit 3,700,000 taxpayers and will remove 1,400,000 persons from the rolls. Unlike younger persons, the greater number of those who have attained the age of 65 are unable to compete for full-time jobs at the present high-wage level. I trust that upon reflection President Truman will sign H. R. 3950 and thus redeem in part at least his promise of cooperation.

It will be recalled that President Truman, just after the election last November 1946, publicly promised cooperation with the Republican majority. He said:

The people have elected a Republican majority to the Senate and to the House of Representatives. Under our Constitution the Congress is the lawmaking body. The

people have chosen to entrust the controlling voice in this branch of our Government to the Republican Party. I accept this verdict in the spirit in which all good citizens accept the result of any fair election.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the Republican Party accepted this admirable gesture of good will and offer of cooperation on the part of President Truman as genuine and forthright in all respects.

An opportunity soon presented itself to the Republican majority in the House and in the Senate to cooperate with the President which was done without hesitation. It will be recalled in this connection that many war excise taxes were about to expire; there was a popular clamor in favor of letting them expire. President Truman recommended and even urged the extension of the war excise taxes rather than let them expire automatically. It will be recalled that the Republicans in the House and in the Senate in response to President Truman's request to continue the excise taxes did extend them.

Most of these excise taxes are now upon the statute books as the result of a sincere attempt on the part of the Republicans to cooperate with President Truman in accordance with the gesture which he made following the election.

It came as a surprise, not only to the Republican Party in both the House and the Senate, but to the entire country when President Truman vetoed H. R. 1 and launched an attack against the proposal of tax reduction.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is true as a number of my colleagues have said that this bill that we are now considering is the same as H. R. 1, except that this bill H. R. 3950 is applicable from January 1, 1948, instead of from January 1, 1947. In other words, by this difference in time the taxpayers failed to get a tax reduction of about \$3,500,000,000 in this year of 1947. But if the present bill is passed the taxpayers will get a reduction of \$3,500,000,000 next year.

When the President in his veto message rejected H. R. 1, he stated that his reason for the veto was that that was not the time to reduce taxes. He further said that he would prefer to pay something on the enormous national debt.

Now we have postponed the date for one full year. It may be that this 1-year extension is not enough, but it seems to me that now is surely the time. The President has never said when the time will be right.

According to figures furnished by the tax experts attached to the Ways and Means Committee we can safely pass this bill and then have about \$5,000,000,000 to apply on the national debt. If we can do this there is no reason for any postponement of tax-reduction legislation. And no person, especially no New Dealer,

should frown at paying as much as \$5,000,000,000 on the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with those who might wish to vote to send this bill back to the committee on a motion to recommit. For if this is done and the exemptions are raised from \$500 to \$700 that will mean an additional reduction of over \$3,000,000,000 in tax receipts for the coming year. That would mean that we would have that much less to apply on the national debt.

I cannot see how anyone can ask for this additional reduction in taxes and then say that he is against the pending bill because it makes it impossible to make a payment on the national debt. The passage of the bill under consideration would permit a greater payment on the national debt than a bill which would lower the amount of taxes collected by \$3,000,000,000 more than the bill under consideration.

Likewise I cannot see how a Member can stand up and declare that he is opposed to the pending bill because this is not the proper time, for surely no time will be the proper time if this is not the proper time. What more could any person want than a situation that will result if this pending bill is passed. If it is passed we will reduce the taxes of forty-nine and one-half million people in the total amount of \$4,000,000,000 and still have \$5,000,000,000 to apply on the national debt. This is a more favorable position than the country has enjoyed since the New Dealers took over the Government 15 years ago.

When we were considering H. R. 1 some weeks ago I said that it was evident that the President was determined to prevent the passage of any tax-reduction law until after he shall have had the opportunity to recommend such a reduction when he addresses the House and Senate in joint session next January when the Congress again comes into session.

Mr. Chairman, there is no just reason why this tax-reduction program should not be passed today by a vote large enough to guarantee its passage over the veto of the President should he decide to veto it.

Now is the accepted time and the passage of H. R. 3950 is the proper way.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this tax bill. I am going to do so, first, because I believe the distribution of tax relief in this present bill is unsound, with an insufficient amount of relief being given to the lower-income groups, those hardest hit by inflation of prices and by indirect taxation.

Secondly, I am opposed to this bill because it provides tax relief in 1948 at a time—July 1947—when we have no definite knowledge of our tax receipts or our future expenditures, both at home and abroad.

Thirdly, the statistical evidence for the first half of 1947 demonstrates that in both our employment and production

we have reached our highest level in the history of this country, with profits after taxes in the first half of this year at their highest, and with the number of employed at 58,000,000, a record figure.

All of these factors, and other related factors, have caused me to decide to vote against this tax bill. I believe tax relief must be given in peacetime, but it should not be given until the abnormalities of the present have been leveled and we are once again in a peacetime economy.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the time remaining on this side to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a great many of the remarks made on both sides of the aisle today. I am glad to note that no bitter statements have crept into this debate nor any unjustified criticism of anybody from the President down; at least, if they have been made, I have not heard them. When we have debate like that in the Congress of the United States I am always proud of this body, and usually I am very proud of it.

I did, however, hear all of the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. If I had time enough to make only one statement I would say that I would adopt the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] as my own.

The issue before us today is not a contest as between people who want to reduce taxes and people who do not want to reduce taxes. We know that everybody in the House wants to reduce the tax burden which now lies so heavily upon the people of the country. The question we must confront and the question that we will confront is: how and when? I do not believe this is the time. I do not believe our economy is in such a condition that anyone can say with reasonable certainty even to himself that taxes should be reduced a certain amount.

Furthermore, even if I did think now was the time to reduce taxes I would not do it in this way. If the Federal Treasury were in such a condition that it could fulfill its obligations and if I were reducing the taxes of the people of the country, I would allow more of the reduction to go to the low-income people than is provided by this so-called Knutson bill.

I do not know whether anybody else is alarmed or not about our financial and fiscal structure, but I am. I am tremendously interested in what my dollar is going to be worth 2 years from now—5 years from now—10 years from now. I know that if there is any recession whatsoever, and there must be one sometime because prices cannot keep on going up, it will be that much more difficult for people to feed and clothe and house themselves. I know the greatest thing that I can do to safeguard the value of my dollar in the future is to reduce this tremendous and crushing national debt which we have upon us at this time. I know that \$258,000,000,000 is almost an inconceivable amount of money.

Every dollar that we pay on that, every dollar that we reduce it, makes my dollar more stable, makes my dollar sounder.

Our friends on the left have since long before 1896 talked about the soundness of the money that the people are to have in their pockets to spend. Nobody knows yet, even though this \$6,000,000,000 gesture was made several weeks ago, how much money we are going to spend, even on the regular appropriation bills, much less the extraordinary appropriation bills, in the fiscal year 1948. So it would appear to me to be the sound, the wise, the sane thing to do to wait until the first of the year or maybe until the 15th of March 1948 and have a look around and see how much money is going to be produced in the way of taxes in this calendar year of 1948 before we begin reducing taxes. It seems to me that that is so sound, that it is so unanswerable, that it should take hold, even upon one who is most anxious, politically or otherwise, to reduce taxes at an early date.

There is going to be a motion to recommend. I want it understood that I am not for any tax reduction at this time, for the reasons I have given, but those who desire some tax reduction now, and want it fairer to the man with the average income than the pending bill, can vote for the motion to recommend, which will provide that 80 percent of the relief provided will go to people of \$5,000 or less income, while the pending bill gives only 62 percent of relief to that group. It would appear to me that the low-income man, the salaried man, the white-collared man, who is having a terrific time getting along now, with stabilized wages and still-mounting prices, should be the men and women who are to have first consideration in a tax-reduction bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, if it were possible for the Members of Congress to offer amendments to the tax bill we now have under debate, I would like to offer as amendments two provisions which were included in my tax bill, H. R. 4087. These are, first, that the effective date of the tax reduction be made July 1, 1947, instead of January 1, 1948; second, a 40-percent reduction in income taxes for that great mass of people in the lower income brackets, particularly that class commonly referred to as the white-collar workers. However, inasmuch as I will not be able to offer these amendments under the rule that governs the consideration of the tax bill before us, and appreciating that the people of this country in all walks of life are clamoring for relief from the oppressive wartime taxes, I will support the measure. If this bill is not passed today our people will not obtain relief from the heavy burden because, in my opinion, no other tax bill will be passed in this session of Congress.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the roll call on H. R. 3950 the new tax-reduction bill, was completed; 302 voted in favor of the bill and 112 voted against the bill. It now goes to the Senate to be considered by that body. H. R. 3950 is identical with H. R.

1, which was passed by the House and Senate a few weeks ago and vetoed by the President with one single exception. That is the tax-reduction bill vetoed by the President would have been operative as of July 1, 1947. The tax reductions provided in H. R. 3950 become operative January 1, 1948.

On June 30, 1947, this Nation closed its business in the black with a sizable surplus in the Treasury. For 17 consecutive years this Nation has been closing with a heavy deficit. We were able to end up with a balanced budget and a surplus by reason of the wise action of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress in effecting savings by cutting out hundreds of thousands of useless Federal officeholders, cutting out waste and unnecessary expenditures. Because of this action we find a balanced budget and a surplus that clearly justifies a tax reduction. This is the first genuine tax reduction in 17 years. The war has been over now approximately 2 years with the same high wartime taxes still in force on individual incomes and excise taxes.

This bill will give relief to nearly 50,000,000 individual income-tax payers and will save them approximately \$4,000,000,000. This bill gives 30 percent reduction of taxes to the workers on the railroads, farms, in the shops, mines, mills, stores, restaurants, to the teachers and to all of those in the low-income-tax brackets. It gives an additional \$500 exemption to approximately 1,500,000 persons 65 years of age and over. It gives 20 percent reduction in taxes to the next or middle group of individual income-tax payers, numbering 15 to 18 million persons. It gives only 10½ percent reduction to the top group of individual income-tax payers. However, in this top income-tax group, they can be taxed as much as 76½ percent. At the present time, they are paying approximately 87 percent of their taxable income. I think all of us must agree that it is hitting a man's income pretty hard when you take 76½ percent out of every dollar for taxes.

This talk about giving the relief to the rich and little consideration to the persons of medium or low incomes is not supported by the facts. In the low incomes, they have 30 percent relief and in the high incomes, only 10½, while those of incomes in the medium brackets have 20 percent reduction.

#### TAX REDUCTION FOR BIG CORPORATIONS IN SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

There should be no tax reduction unless there is a surplus. However, our Democratic friends, in the last Congress, passed a bill giving a 10 percent across the board tax reduction to corporations and others. This afforded billions of dollars of tax reduction to the corporations of the Nation, and thousands of these corporations made very high profits during the war. We heard no talk about helping the low and medium group of income taxpayers. At the time they put through this phony income-tax reduction in which the big corporations shared heavily, we were facing a deficit for that particular year of tens of billions of dollars. There was no surplus in the Treasury, we were then

going in the red heavily and had been for many years, yet our Democratic friends, for what I believe was purely political purposes to aid in the election of a Democratic Congress in 1946, put through this phony tax-reduction bill.

At the very time that tax-reduction bill was being considered we had the stars from Hollywood and the high-pressure salesmen going over the country in a drive to sell billions of dollars of new bonds and increase our public debt. No one could justify that tax reduction when we were faced with a tremendous deficit and at the same time selling new bonds and creating new debts, yet the administration urged that sort of a tax reduction bill under those circumstances. If a bank should declare a dividend in any year it was facing a deficit, they could and really should be prosecuted, but our Democratic friends were willing to declare a dividend in taxes and sell new bonds to replace the revenues that were taken away by tax reduction, but now we, for the first time in 17 years, have a balanced budget and a surplus in the Treasury and such reduction in the expenditures of the Government that we can legally, justly and properly give to the American people this tax relief and we give the greater amount of relief to those who need relief most, but President Truman is opposing it.

#### REPUBLICAN CONGRESS HAS MADE IT POSSIBLE

Early in the Eightieth Congress the President submitted his budget requesting the Congress to appropriate and make available for him and his administration for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, the enormous sum of \$37,500,000,000. This is an enormous sum to be expended for the third peacetime year since the war closed. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as I recall, never asked for more than about one-third of that sum in any peacetime year. The Republicans have and will effect savings in the Eightieth Congress of approximately \$5,000,000,000, and but for these savings no tax reduction bill could be possible at all this year.

The only way to cut down taxes is to cut expenditures. Our Democratic friends have developed a high technique in increasing taxes and in increasing the expenditures of the Government, and the President and his leaders have been fighting vigorously and they continue to fight vigorously reduction in expenditures and reduction in taxes.

I wish here to commend the scores of Democrats who have joined with the Republicans in the House in reducing expenditures and in the reduction of taxes. The demand of the American people for a reduction in expenditures and taxes has been growing day by day. When the President's veto was up for consideration in the House some weeks ago 273 voted to override the President's veto and 137 voted to sustain his veto. Today 302 voted in favor of the tax bill and only 112 voted against it. This indicates to me that if the President should veto this bill the House will pass it over his veto—26 votes more than the necessary two-thirds. I am very hopeful that the Presi-

dent will sign this bill and give this long-deserved relief to the nearly 50,000,000 taxpayers of this country. It will put into the pockets of the working people additional money to spend for themselves and their families, and it will encourage those who have funds to invest them in job-producing enterprises. It will make for general prosperity in the Nation. People who have money to invest will not long continue to take all the risks of loss in going into new enterprises, and then when they do make money have to give approximately 87 percent of their taxable income to the Government.

We must constantly work for economy, honesty and efficiency in the Government and keep in mind other taxes that are paid by the American people to their districts, cities, counties and States. At present the working people and others of low incomes are paying at least one-third of their income for taxes. This bill may not go as far as many of us would like to see it go but the relief provided in this bill is certainly much better than no relief at all.

A general tax reduction bill is now being prepared by the Ways and Means Committee dealing with all Federal taxes including excise taxes to be introduced and considered early in 1948. Many high excise taxes must be cut out or reduced.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak for the tax-reduction bill not as a partisan, but because I believe it is an essential part of our readjustment to peace. I am also convinced the Congress must retain and protect its rightful prerogative of determining when and how much taxes shall be levied upon the people.

When this Congress convened, it was obvious, if we were to put America back on the right track, we must drastically reduce Government spending. It was essential we achieve a balanced budget; begin paying off the national debt; and give some tax relief to the 49,000,000 of people who bore uncomplainingly enormous tax burdens for victory in the war.

It is an unusual procedure which we are proposing in this House today, as we attempt, in the same session of the Congress, to reenact a major piece of legislation which has been in disagreement between the executive and the legislative branches.

Oppressive taxes have toppled many a government to destruction, and many a monarch from his throne. I urge you to remember three vital facts:

First. The tendency of all governments is to continue endless expansion of spending to the point of ruin.

Second. Taxes come from the labor, the sweat, the privations, and the thrift of all the people.

Third. The people finally tire of intolerable tax burdens; business withers; production slows down; initiative is discouraged; frustration replaces confidence and hope—and the Government falls before the onslaughts of demagogues who

find in chaos their opportunity for temporary power and loot.

The people last November demanded government costs be cut and the tax burden lightened.

We have balanced the budget; we have curtailed spending; we shall make a substantial payment on the debt. All now needed to complete this well-coordinated program is to give the 49,000,000 of American people a tax break.

This House has performed a magnificent job of cutting out wasteful, extravagant, "don't-count-the-cost" practices of bureaucratic spending, as the people demanded.

This tax bill is a straightforward, honest, open program. No trick economics and no false promises are to be found in it.

There is no use of trying to confuse the issue by substitute proposals. Everyone knows it is this bill reported out of the Ways and Means Committee, or no bill. And let no one forget; the American people do want tax reductions.

The appropriation reductions have been made on a sound basis, against terrific pressures of hostile propaganda. Our task was to preserve the solvency of the Government and insure the safety of the people's assets in bonds, savings, and insurance policies.

This Congress is succeeding in this vital mission. It merits the gratitude and the support of everyone who loves America and our way of life.

The taxicab driver, the cook, the housemaid, the millions of school teachers, policemen, firemen, factory and office workers, people in the lower salary brackets everywhere, all will welcome the extra take-home pay which will be theirs with the passage of this bill.

Our people should not be required to support an inflated wartime tax structure. There is no valid reason for refusing them this relief from excessively burdensome wartime taxes.

Certainly we ought to do half as well by our taxpayers as Canada and Great Britain have. Great Britain has reduced her tax rates twice in the postwar years. Canada has reduced hers twice.

The pending measure gives the greatest relief to those least able to pay.

The people won't believe you wanted to get them greater tax reduction if the final result is no bill at all. They will not accept excuses.

This bill would relieve of all taxes nearly a million of our poorest people—people over 65, whose individual income is under \$1,000. That advantage may well be the means of them getting really sufficient food.

I cannot agree with the doctrine advanced by some that it is unwise to give the American people tax reduction because they already have too much money. More money in the hands of the people will bring a higher standard of living.

We all know if we permit the Government to pursue a policy of ever-increasing spending, it will do so. It is much easier for bureaus and commissions and departments to find reasons for increasing expenditures than for cutting them.

We all know high taxes mean high prices and inflation.

Venture capital must be encouraged. High taxes retard business expansion. They reduce job opportunities for men and women who must work. They help to maintain high costs, because taxes are involved in all costs.

Tax-rate cuts do not necessarily mean corresponding losses to the Treasury. The history of this Nation abounds in evidence that lower tax rates stimulate commerce and trade, which in turn yield greater Federal revenues.

Action now will reassure the American people this Congress serves the best interests of the Nation. I hope the Congress passes the pending measure by such a decisive vote as to persuade the President the people should have this delayed justice.

If we do not achieve these tax reductions by next January we will dishearten our people. Let us make it possible for Americans to enjoy a fairer share of the fruits of their labor.

Colleagues, we must end loose fiscal policies and excessive taxation and begin to practice real economy. We must give progress a boost; we must give prosperity a pat on the back; we must hand a torch of hope to our overburdened people; we must give the younger citizens a break; we must think about the welfare of our own people while we are pondering the problems of all the rest of the world. Pass this bill and give America an impetus toward new horizons of hope and peace.

The necessity for this tax bill is great. But an even greater issue is involved in this proposition. It is the fundamental question of whether or not the Congress shall retain its right to perform its constitutional function of determining what taxes shall be levied on the people.

In all our history there has been but one other Executive who ever attempted to invade the tax-making power of the Congress. That effort was turned back. Shall the Members of the Eightieth Congress be less vigilant to preserve the

rights of the people's representatives than the Congress which foiled the first attempt?

We must set our faces sternly against any attempt to whittle away the functions and the prerogatives of the Congress. Unless Congress protects its right to determine the taxes which shall be levied upon the people, and the right to direct the spending of the public funds, the foundations of our American system of government will be destroyed. Then we would no longer have a government of the people.

Colleagues, let us pass this tax bill now.

Let us vote down the motion to recommit if offered as it would simply mean no tax legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read.

The bill H. R. 3950 follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947."

#### SEC. 2. Reduction in Normal Tax and Surtax on Individuals

(a) Reduction in normal tax on individuals: Section 11 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the normal tax on individuals) is hereby amended to read as follows:

##### "Sec. 11. Normal Tax on Individuals

"There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of every individual a normal tax determined by computing a tentative normal tax of 3 percent of the amount of the net income in excess of the credits against net income provided in section 25, and by reducing such tentative normal tax as provided in section 12 (g). For alternative tax which may be elected if adjusted gross income is less than \$5,000, see Supplement T."

(b) Reduction in surtax on individuals: Section 12 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the rate of surtax on individuals) is hereby amended by striking out "by 5 percent thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof "as provided in subsection (g) of this section."

(c) Reduction of tentative normal tax and tentative surtax: Section 12 (g) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) Reduction of tentative normal tax and tentative surtax:

"(1) The combined normal tax and surtax under section 11 and subsection (b) of this section shall be the aggregate of the tentative normal tax and tentative surtax, reduced as follows:

If the aggregate is: The reduction shall be:  
Not over \$200----- 33½ percent of the aggregate.

Over \$200 but not over \$279.17. \$67.

Over \$279.17 but not over \$100,000. 24 percent of the aggregate.

Over \$100,000 but not over \$250,000. \$24,000, plus 19¼ percent of excess over \$100,000.

Over \$250,000----- \$52,875, plus 15 percent of excess over \$250,000.

In no event shall the combined normal tax and surtax exceed 76½ percent of the net income of the taxpayer for the taxable year.

"(2) Whenever it is necessary to ascertain the normal tax and the surtax separately, the surtax shall be an amount which is the same proportion of the combined normal tax and surtax as the tentative surtax is of the aggregate of the tentative normal tax and tentative surtax; and the normal tax shall be the remainder of such combined normal tax and surtax.

"(3) In the application of this subsection, the combined normal tax and surtax shall be computed without regard to the credits provided in sections 31, 32, and 35."

(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948, see section 6.

#### SEC. 3. Individuals With Adjusted Gross Incomes of Less Than \$5,000

(a) In general: Section 400 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to optional tax on individuals with adjusted gross incomes of less than \$5,000) is hereby amended to read as follows:

##### "Sec. 400. Imposition of Tax

"In lieu of the taxes imposed by sections 11 and 12, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of each individual whose adjusted gross income for such year is less than \$5,000, and who has elected to pay the tax imposed by this supplement for such year, a tax as follows:

| If adjusted gross income is— |               | And the number of exemptions is— |     |     |     |           | If adjusted gross income is— |               | And the number of exemptions is— |       |      |     |     |     |     |     |           |
|------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| At least                     | But less than | 1                                | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5 or more | At least                     | But less than | 1                                | 2     | 3    | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 or more |
| The tax shall be—            |               |                                  |     |     |     |           | The tax shall be—            |               |                                  |       |      |     |     |     |     |     |           |
| \$0                          | \$550         | \$0                              | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0       | \$2,275                      | \$2,300       | \$237                            | \$145 | \$74 | \$8 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0       |
| 550                          | 575           | 1                                | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,300                        | 2,325         | 240                              | 149   | 77   | 11  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 575                          | 600           | 4                                | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,325                        | 2,350         | 244                              | 154   | 80   | 14  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 600                          | 625           | 7                                | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,350                        | 2,375         | 247                              | 158   | 83   | 17  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 625                          | 650           | 10                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,375                        | 2,400         | 251                              | 163   | 86   | 20  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 650                          | 675           | 13                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,400                        | 2,425         | 254                              | 167   | 89   | 23  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 675                          | 700           | 16                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,425                        | 2,450         | 257                              | 172   | 92   | 26  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 700                          | 725           | 19                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,450                        | 2,475         | 261                              | 176   | 95   | 29  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 725                          | 750           | 22                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,475                        | 2,500         | 264                              | 181   | 98   | 32  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 750                          | 775           | 25                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,500                        | 2,525         | 268                              | 185   | 101  | 35  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 775                          | 800           | 28                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,525                        | 2,550         | 271                              | 190   | 104  | 38  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 800                          | 825           | 31                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,550                        | 2,575         | 275                              | 194   | 107  | 41  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 825                          | 850           | 34                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,575                        | 2,600         | 278                              | 199   | 110  | 44  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 850                          | 875           | 37                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,600                        | 2,625         | 281                              | 203   | 113  | 47  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 875                          | 900           | 40                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,625                        | 2,650         | 285                              | 208   | 116  | 50  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 900                          | 925           | 43                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,650                        | 2,675         | 288                              | 212   | 119  | 53  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 925                          | 950           | 46                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,675                        | 2,700         | 292                              | 216   | 122  | 56  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 950                          | 975           | 49                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,700                        | 2,725         | 295                              | 219   | 125  | 59  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 975                          | 1,000         | 52                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,725                        | 2,750         | 298                              | 222   | 128  | 62  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,000                        | 1,025         | 55                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,750                        | 2,775         | 302                              | 226   | 131  | 65  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,025                        | 1,050         | 58                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,775                        | 2,800         | 305                              | 229   | 135  | 68  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,050                        | 1,075         | 61                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,800                        | 2,825         | 309                              | 233   | 139  | 71  | 4   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,075                        | 1,100         | 64                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,825                        | 2,850         | 313                              | 236   | 144  | 74  | 7   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,100                        | 1,125         | 67                               | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,850                        | 2,875         | 317                              | 240   | 148  | 77  | 10  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,125                        | 1,150         | 70                               | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,875                        | 2,900         | 321                              | 243   | 153  | 80  | 13  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,150                        | 1,175         | 73                               | 6   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,900                        | 2,925         | 324                              | 246   | 157  | 83  | 16  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,175                        | 1,200         | 76                               | 9   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,925                        | 2,950         | 328                              | 250   | 162  | 86  | 19  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,200                        | 1,225         | 79                               | 12  | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,950                        | 2,975         | 332                              | 253   | 166  | 89  | 22  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,225                        | 1,250         | 82                               | 15  | 0   | 0   | 0         | 2,975                        | 3,000         | 336                              | 257   | 171  | 92  | 25  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,250                        | 1,275         | 85                               | 18  | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,000                        | 3,050         | 341                              | 262   | 178  | 96  | 30  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |

| "If adjusted gross income is— |               | And the number of exemptions is— |      |     |     |           | If adjusted gross income is— |               | And the number of exemptions is |       |       |       |      |     |     |     |           |
|-------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----------|------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|
| At least                      | But less than | 1                                | 2    | 3   | 4   | 5 or more | At least                     | But less than | 1                               | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5    | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 or more |
|                               |               | The tax shall be—                |      |     |     |           |                              |               | The tax shall be—               |       |       |       |      |     |     |     |           |
| \$1,275                       | \$1,300       | \$88                             | \$21 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0       | \$3,050                      | \$3,100       | \$349                           | \$269 | \$187 | \$102 | \$36 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0       |
| 1,300                         | 1,325         | 91                               | 24   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,100                        | 3,150         | 356                             | 276   | 196   | 108   | 42   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,325                         | 1,350         | 94                               | 27   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,150                        | 3,200         | 364                             | 282   | 205   | 114   | 48   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,350                         | 1,375         | 97                               | 30   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,200                        | 3,250         | 371                             | 289   | 213   | 120   | 54   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,375                         | 1,400         | 100                              | 33   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,250                        | 3,300         | 379                             | 296   | 220   | 126   | 60   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,400                         | 1,425         | 103                              | 36   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,300                        | 3,350         | 386                             | 303   | 227   | 132   | 66   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,425                         | 1,450         | 106                              | 39   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,350                        | 3,400         | 394                             | 310   | 234   | 141   | 71   | 5   | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,450                         | 1,475         | 109                              | 42   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,400                        | 3,450         | 401                             | 318   | 241   | 150   | 77   | 11  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,475                         | 1,500         | 112                              | 45   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,450                        | 3,500         | 409                             | 325   | 247   | 159   | 83   | 17  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,500                         | 1,525         | 115                              | 48   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,500                        | 3,550         | 416                             | 333   | 254   | 168   | 89   | 23  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,525                         | 1,550         | 118                              | 51   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,550                        | 3,600         | 424                             | 340   | 261   | 177   | 95   | 29  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,550                         | 1,575         | 121                              | 54   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,600                        | 3,650         | 431                             | 348   | 268   | 186   | 101  | 35  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,575                         | 1,600         | 124                              | 57   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,650                        | 3,700         | 439                             | 355   | 275   | 195   | 107  | 41  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,600                         | 1,625         | 127                              | 60   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,700                        | 3,750         | 447                             | 363   | 282   | 204   | 113  | 47  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,625                         | 1,650         | 130                              | 63   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,750                        | 3,800         | 454                             | 370   | 288   | 212   | 119  | 53  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,650                         | 1,675         | 133                              | 66   | 0   | 0   | 0         | 3,800                        | 3,850         | 462                             | 378   | 295   | 219   | 125  | 59  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,675                         | 1,700         | 137                              | 69   | 2   | 0   | 0         | 3,850                        | 3,900         | 469                             | 386   | 302   | 226   | 131  | 65  | 0   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,700                         | 1,725         | 141                              | 72   | 5   | 0   | 0         | 3,900                        | 3,950         | 477                             | 393   | 309   | 233   | 140  | 71  | 4   | 0   | 0         |
| 1,725                         | 1,750         | 146                              | 75   | 8   | 0   | 0         | 3,950                        | 4,000         | 484                             | 401   | 317   | 240   | 149  | 77  | 10  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,750                         | 1,775         | 150                              | 78   | 11  | 0   | 0         | 4,000                        | 4,050         | 492                             | 408   | 324   | 247   | 158  | 83  | 16  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,775                         | 1,800         | 155                              | 81   | 14  | 0   | 0         | 4,050                        | 4,100         | 499                             | 416   | 332   | 253   | 167  | 89  | 22  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,800                         | 1,825         | 159                              | 84   | 17  | 0   | 0         | 4,100                        | 4,150         | 507                             | 423   | 340   | 260   | 176  | 95  | 28  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,825                         | 1,850         | 164                              | 87   | 20  | 0   | 0         | 4,150                        | 4,200         | 514                             | 431   | 347   | 267   | 185  | 101 | 34  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,850                         | 1,875         | 168                              | 90   | 23  | 0   | 0         | 4,200                        | 4,250         | 522                             | 438   | 355   | 274   | 194  | 107 | 40  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,875                         | 1,900         | 173                              | 93   | 26  | 0   | 0         | 4,250                        | 4,300         | 529                             | 446   | 362   | 281   | 203  | 113 | 46  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,900                         | 1,925         | 177                              | 96   | 29  | 0   | 0         | 4,300                        | 4,350         | 537                             | 453   | 370   | 288   | 212  | 119 | 52  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,925                         | 1,950         | 182                              | 99   | 32  | 0   | 0         | 4,350                        | 4,400         | 544                             | 461   | 377   | 295   | 219  | 125 | 58  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,950                         | 1,975         | 186                              | 102  | 35  | 0   | 0         | 4,400                        | 4,450         | 552                             | 468   | 385   | 301   | 225  | 131 | 64  | 0   | 0         |
| 1,975                         | 2,000         | 191                              | 105  | 38  | 0   | 0         | 4,450                        | 4,500         | 559                             | 476   | 392   | 309   | 232  | 139 | 70  | 4   | 0         |
| 2,000                         | 2,025         | 195                              | 108  | 41  | 0   | 0         | 4,500                        | 4,550         | 567                             | 483   | 400   | 316   | 239  | 148 | 76  | 10  | 0         |
| 2,025                         | 2,050         | 200                              | 111  | 44  | 0   | 0         | 4,550                        | 4,600         | 574                             | 491   | 407   | 324   | 246  | 157 | 82  | 16  | 0         |
| 2,050                         | 2,075         | 204                              | 114  | 47  | 0   | 0         | 4,600                        | 4,650         | 582                             | 498   | 415   | 331   | 253  | 166 | 88  | 22  | 0         |
| 2,075                         | 2,100         | 209                              | 117  | 50  | 0   | 0         | 4,650                        | 4,700         | 589                             | 506   | 422   | 339   | 260  | 175 | 94  | 28  | 0         |
| 2,100                         | 2,125         | 213                              | 120  | 53  | 0   | 0         | 4,700                        | 4,750         | 597                             | 513   | 430   | 346   | 266  | 184 | 100 | 34  | 0         |
| 2,125                         | 2,150         | 216                              | 123  | 56  | 0   | 0         | 4,750                        | 4,800         | 605                             | 521   | 437   | 354   | 273  | 193 | 106 | 40  | 0         |
| 2,150                         | 2,175         | 220                              | 126  | 59  | 0   | 0         | 4,800                        | 4,850         | 612                             | 528   | 445   | 361   | 280  | 202 | 112 | 46  | 0         |
| 2,175                         | 2,200         | 223                              | 129  | 62  | 0   | 0         | 4,850                        | 4,900         | 620                             | 536   | 452   | 369   | 287  | 211 | 118 | 52  | 0         |
| 2,200                         | 2,225         | 227                              | 132  | 65  | 0   | 0         | 4,900                        | 4,950         | 627                             | 544   | 460   | 376   | 294  | 218 | 124 | 58  | 0         |
| 2,225                         | 2,250         | 230                              | 136  | 68  | 2   | 0         | 4,950                        | 5,000         | 635                             | 551   | 467   | 384   | 301  | 225 | 130 | 64  | 0         |
| 2,250                         | 2,275         | 234                              | 140  | 71  | 5   | 0         |                              |               |                                 |       |       |       |      |     |     |     |           |

(b) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948, see section 6.

#### SEC. 4. Additional Credit Against Net Income for Normal Tax and Surtax

(a) Exemption for age: Section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits against net income for normal tax and surtax) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

"(D) an additional exemption of \$500 for the taxpayer if he has attained the age of 65 on or before the last day of his taxable year;

"(E) an additional exemption of \$500 for the spouse of the taxpayer if—

"(i) a joint return is made by the taxpayer and his spouse under section 51 and the spouse has attained the age of 65 on or before such last day in which case the aggregate exemption of the spouses under subparagraph (D) and this subparagraph shall not exceed \$500 with respect to each spouse who has attained the age of 65 on or before such last day; or

"(ii) a separate return is made by the taxpayer, and his spouse has attained the age of 65 on or before such last day and has no gross income for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins and is not the dependent of another taxpayer."

(b) Technical amendments:

(1) Section 58 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to requirement of declaration of estimated tax) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) his gross income from wages (as defined in section 1621) can reasonably be expected to exceed the sum of \$4,500 plus \$500 with respect to each exemption provided in section 25 (b); or."

(2) Section 1622 (h) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to withholding exemptions) is hereby amended by striking out subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) An exemption for himself, and an additional exemption for himself if he has attained the age of 65 or will attain such age before the expiration of the taxable year under chapter 1 in respect of which amounts deducted and withheld under this subchapter in the calendar year in which such day falls are allowed as a credit.

"(B) If the employee is married, any exemption to which his spouse is entitled, or would be entitled if she were an employee receiving wages, under subparagraph (A), but only if such spouse does not have in effect a withholding exemption certificate claiming such exemption."

(3) Section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deduction of medical, etc., expenses) is hereby amended by striking out the second and third sentences thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The maximum deduction for the taxable year shall be \$1,250, except that if more than one exemption is allowed under section 25 (b) for the taxable year (exclusive of an exemption under section 25 (b) (1) (D)) the maximum deduction for the taxable year shall be \$2,500."

(c) Taxable years to which applicable. The amendments made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947. For treatment of taxable years beginning in 1947 and ending in 1948, see section 6.

#### SEC. 5. Reduction in Withholding of Tax at Source on Wages

(a) Percentage method. Section 1622 (a) and section 1622 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to percentage method of withholding) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Requirement of withholding: Every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages a tax equal to the sum of the following:

"(1) 12 per centum of whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(A) the amount by which the wages exceed the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in the table in subsection (b) (1); or

"(B) the amount shown in the second column in the table in subsection (b) (1);

"(2) 18 per centum of whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(A) the amount by which the wages exceed the sum of—

"(i) the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in the table in subsection (b) (1); plus

"(ii) the amount shown in the second column in the table in subsection (b) (1); or

"(B) the amount shown in the third column in the table in subsection (b) (1);

"(3) 14 per centum of the amount by which the wages exceed the sum of—

"(A) the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in the table in subsection (b) (1); plus

"(B) the sum of the amounts shown in the second and third columns in the table in subsection (b) (1).

"(b) (1) The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

"Percentage method withholding table

| "Pay-roll period                                     | 1<br>Amount of one withholding exemption | 2<br>Maximum amount subject to 12 percent rate | 3<br>Maximum amount subject to 18 percent rate |
|--|--|--|--|
| Weekly.....  | \$11.00                                  | \$21.00  | \$9.00   |
| Biweekly.....  | 22.00                                    | 43.00  | 17.00  |
| Semimonthly.....                                     | 23.00                                    | 46.00  | 19.00  |
| Monthly.....   | 46.00                                    | 93.00  | 36.00  |
| Quarterly.....                                       | 139.00                                   | 278.00   | 110.00   |
| Semiannual.....                                      | 278.00                                   | 556.00   | 219.00   |
| Annual.....  | 556.00                                   | 1,111.00                                       | 440.00   |
| Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)..... | 1.50                                     | 3.00   | 1.00"  |

(b) Wage-bracket withholding: The tables contained in section 1622 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to wage-bracket withholding) are hereby amended to read as follows:

*"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly—*

| And the wages are—                         |               | And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is— |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
|--|---------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| At least                                   | But less than | 0  | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10 or more |
| The amount of tax to be withheld shall be— |               |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
| \$0.....                                   | \$11.....     | 12% of wages   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0        |
| \$11.....                                  | \$12.....     | \$1.40   | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$12.....                                  | \$13.....     | 1.50   | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$13.....                                  | \$14.....     | 1.60   | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$14.....                                  | \$15.....     | 1.70   | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$15.....                                  | \$16.....     | 1.90   | .60   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$16.....                                  | \$17.....     | 2.00   | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$17.....                                  | \$18.....     | 2.10   | .80   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$18.....                                  | \$19.....     | 2.20   | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$19.....                                  | \$20.....     | 2.30   | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$20.....                                  | \$21.....     | 2.50   | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$21.....                                  | \$22.....     | 2.60   | 1.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$22.....                                  | \$23.....     | 2.80   | 1.40  | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$23.....                                  | \$24.....     | 2.90   | 1.50  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$24.....                                  | \$25.....     | 3.10   | 1.70  | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$25.....                                  | \$26.....     | 3.30   | 1.80  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$26.....                                  | \$27.....     | 3.50   | 1.90  | .60   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$27.....                                  | \$28.....     | 3.70   | 2.00  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$28.....                                  | \$29.....     | 3.80   | 2.10  | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$29.....                                  | \$30.....     | 4.00   | 2.30  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$30.....                                  | \$31.....     | 4.20   | 2.40  | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$31.....                                  | \$32.....     | 4.30   | 2.50  | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$32.....                                  | \$33.....     | 4.40   | 2.60  | 1.30  | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$33.....                                  | \$34.....     | 4.60   | 2.80  | 1.50  | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$34.....                                  | \$35.....     | 4.70   | 3.00  | 1.60  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$35.....                                  | \$36.....     | 4.90   | 3.20  | 1.70  | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$36.....                                  | \$37.....     | 5.00   | 3.40  | 1.80  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$37.....                                  | \$38.....     | 5.10   | 3.50  | 1.90  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$38.....                                  | \$39.....     | 5.20   | 3.70  | 2.10  | .80   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$39.....                                  | \$40.....     | 5.40   | 3.90  | 2.20  | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$40.....                                  | \$41.....     | 5.50   | 4.10  | 2.30  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$41.....                                  | \$42.....     | 5.70   | 4.20  | 2.40  | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$42.....                                  | \$43.....     | 5.80   | 4.40  | 2.50  | 1.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$43.....                                  | \$44.....     | 6.00   | 4.50  | 2.70  | 1.40  | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$44.....                                  | \$45.....     | 6.10   | 4.60  | 2.90  | 1.50  | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$45.....                                  | \$46.....     | 6.20   | 4.80  | 3.10  | 1.60  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$46.....                                  | \$47.....     | 6.40   | 4.90  | 3.20  | 1.70  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$47.....                                  | \$48.....     | 6.50   | 5.00  | 3.40  | 1.80  | .60   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$48.....                                  | \$49.....     | 6.60   | 5.20  | 3.60  | 2.00  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$49.....                                  | \$50.....     | 6.80   | 5.30  | 3.80  | 2.10  | .80   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$50.....                                  | \$51.....     | 6.90   | 5.40  | 4.00  | 2.20  | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$51.....                                  | \$52.....     | 7.00   | 5.60  | 4.10  | 2.30  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$52.....                                  | \$53.....     | 7.20   | 5.70  | 4.30  | 2.40  | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$53.....                                  | \$54.....     | 7.30   | 5.90  | 4.40  | 2.60  | 1.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$54.....                                  | \$55.....     | 7.50   | 6.00  | 4.50  | 2.80  | 1.40  | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$55.....                                  | \$56.....     | 7.60   | 6.10  | 4.70  | 2.90  | 1.50  | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$56.....                                  | \$57.....     | 7.70   | 6.30  | 4.80  | 3.10  | 1.60  | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$57.....                                  | \$58.....     | 7.90   | 6.40  | 4.90  | 3.30  | 1.80  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$58.....                                  | \$59.....     | 8.00   | 6.50  | 5.10  | 3.50  | 1.90  | .60   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$59.....                                  | \$60.....     | 8.10   | 6.70  | 5.20  | 3.70  | 2.00  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$60.....                                  | \$61.....     | 8.30   | 6.90  | 5.40  | 3.90  | 2.20  | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$61.....                                  | \$62.....     | 8.60   | 7.20  | 5.70  | 4.20  | 2.40  | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$62.....                                  | \$63.....     | 8.90   | 7.40  | 6.00  | 4.50  | 2.70  | 1.40  | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$63.....                                  | \$64.....     | 9.20   | 7.70  | 6.20  | 4.80  | 3.10  | 1.60  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$64.....                                  | \$65.....     | 9.40   | 8.00  | 6.50  | 5.10  | 3.40  | 1.90  | .60   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$65.....                                  | \$66.....     | 9.70   | 8.30  | 6.80  | 5.30  | 3.80  | 2.10  | .80   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$66.....                                  | \$67.....     | 10.00  | 8.50  | 7.10  | 5.60  | 4.10  | 2.30  | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$67.....                                  | \$68.....     | 10.30  | 8.80  | 7.30  | 5.90  | 4.40  | 2.60  | 1.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$68.....                                  | \$69.....     | 10.50  | 9.10  | 7.60  | 6.10  | 4.70  | 3.00  | 1.50  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$69.....                                  | \$70.....     | 10.80  | 9.30  | 7.90  | 6.40  | 5.00  | 3.30  | 1.80  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$70.....                                  | \$71.....     | 11.10  | 9.60  | 8.20  | 6.70  | 5.20  | 3.70  | 2.00  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$71.....                                  | \$72.....     | 11.40  | 9.90  | 8.40  | 7.00  | 5.50  | 4.00  | 2.30  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$72.....                                  | \$73.....     | 11.60  | 10.20 | 8.70  | 7.20  | 5.80  | 4.30  | 2.50  | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$73.....                                  | \$74.....     | 11.90  | 10.40 | 9.00  | 7.50  | 6.10  | 4.60  | 2.80  | 1.50  | .20   | 0     | 0          |
| \$74.....                                  | \$75.....     | 12.20  | 10.70 | 9.30  | 7.80  | 6.30  | 4.90  | 3.20  | 1.70  | .40   | 0     | 0          |
| \$75.....                                  | \$76.....     | 12.40  | 11.00 | 9.50  | 8.10  | 6.60  | 5.10  | 3.60  | 1.90  | .70   | 0     | 0          |
| \$76.....                                  | \$77.....     | 12.70  | 11.30 | 9.80  | 8.30  | 6.90  | 5.40  | 3.90  | 2.20  | .90   | 0     | 0          |
| \$77.....                                  | \$78.....     | 13.00  | 11.50 | 10.10 | 8.60  | 7.10  | 5.70  | 4.20  | 2.40  | 1.10  | 0     | 0          |
| \$78.....                                  | \$79.....     | 13.30  | 11.80 | 10.30 | 8.90  | 7.40  | 6.00  | 4.50  | 2.70  | 1.40  | .10   | 0          |
| \$79.....                                  | \$80.....     | 13.50  | 12.10 | 10.60 | 9.20  | 7.70  | 6.20  | 4.80  | 3.10  | 1.60  | .30   | 0          |
| \$80.....                                  | \$81.....     | 13.80  | 12.40 | 10.90 | 9.50  | 8.00  | 6.50  | 5.10  | 3.40  | 2.00  | .80   | 0          |
| \$81.....                                  | \$82.....     | 14.00  | 12.60 | 11.10 | 9.70  | 8.20  | 6.70  | 5.30  | 3.70  | 2.30  | 1.00  | .10        |
| \$82.....                                  | \$83.....     | 14.70  | 13.20 | 11.80 | 10.30 | 8.90  | 7.40  | 5.90  | 4.50  | 2.70  | 1.40  | .70        |
| \$83.....                                  | \$84.....     | 15.40  | 13.90 | 12.50 | 11.00 | 9.50  | 8.10  | 6.60  | 5.20  | 3.60  | 2.00  | 1.30       |
| \$84.....                                  | \$85.....     | 16.10  | 14.60 | 13.20 | 11.70 | 10.20 | 8.80  | 7.30  | 5.80  | 4.40  | 2.60  | 1.90       |
| \$85.....                                  | \$86.....     | 16.80  | 15.30 | 13.90 | 12.40 | 10.90 | 9.50  | 8.00  | 6.50  | 5.10  | 3.50  | 2.50       |
| \$86.....                                  | \$87.....     | 17.40  | 16.00 | 14.50 | 13.10 | 11.60 | 10.10 | 8.70  | 7.20  | 5.70  | 4.30  | 3.10       |
| \$87.....                                  | \$88.....     | 18.10  | 16.70 | 15.20 | 13.70 | 12.30 | 10.80 | 9.40  | 7.90  | 6.40  | 5.00  | 3.80       |
| \$88.....                                  | \$89.....     | 18.80  | 17.30 | 15.90 | 14.40 | 13.00 | 11.50 | 10.00 | 8.60  | 7.10  | 5.70  | 4.50       |
| \$89.....                                  | \$90.....     | 19.50  | 18.00 | 16.60 | 15.10 | 13.60 | 12.20 | 10.70 | 9.30  | 7.80  | 6.30  | 5.20       |
| \$90.....                                  | \$91.....     | 20.20  | 18.70 | 17.30 | 15.80 | 14.30 | 12.90 | 11.40 | 9.90  | 8.50  | 7.00  | 5.90       |
| \$91.....                                  | \$92.....     | 21.20  | 19.70 | 18.30 | 16.80 | 15.40 | 13.90 | 12.40 | 11.00 | 9.50  | 8.10  | 6.60       |
| \$92.....                                  | \$93.....     | 22.60  | 21.10 | 19.60 | 18.20 | 16.70 | 15.30 | 13.80 | 12.30 | 10.90 | 9.40  | 8.00       |
| \$93.....                                  | \$94.....     | 23.90  | 22.50 | 21.00 | 19.60 | 18.10 | 16.60 | 15.20 | 13.70 | 12.20 | 10.80 | 9.30       |
| \$94.....                                  | \$95.....     | 25.30  | 23.80 | 22.40 | 20.90 | 19.50 | 18.00 | 16.50 | 15.10 | 13.60 | 12.20 | 10.70      |
| \$95.....                                  | \$96.....     | 26.70  | 25.20 | 23.80 | 22.30 | 20.80 | 19.40 | 17.90 | 16.40 | 15.00 | 13.50 | 12.10      |
| 14 percent of the excess over \$200 plus   |               |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
| \$200 and over.....                        |               | 27.40  | 25.90 | 24.40 | 23.00 | 21.50 | 20.10 | 18.60 | 17.10 | 15.70 | 14.20 | 12.70"     |

*"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly—"*

| And the wages are—                         |               | And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is— |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
|--|---------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| At least                                   | But less than | 0  | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10 or more |
| The amount of tax to be withheld shall be— |               |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
| \$0.                                       | \$20.         | 12% of wages   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0        |
| \$20.                                      | \$22.         | \$2.50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$22.                                      | \$24.         | 2.80   | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$24.                                      | \$26.         | 3.00   | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$26.                                      | \$28.         | 3.20   | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$28.                                      | \$30.         | 3.50   | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$30.                                      | \$32.         | 3.70   | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$32.                                      | \$34.         | 4.00   | 1.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$34.                                      | \$36.         | 4.20   | 1.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$36.                                      | \$38.         | 4.40   | 1.90  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$38.                                      | \$40.         | 4.70   | 2.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$40.                                      | \$42.         | 4.90   | 2.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$42.                                      | \$44.         | 5.20   | 2.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$44.                                      | \$46.         | 5.50   | 2.80  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$46.                                      | \$48.         | 5.90   | 3.10  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$48.                                      | \$50.         | 6.20   | 3.30  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$50.                                      | \$52.         | 6.60   | 3.50  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$52.                                      | \$54.         | 7.00   | 3.80  | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$54.                                      | \$56.         | 7.30   | 4.00  | 1.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$56.                                      | \$58.         | 7.70   | 4.30  | 1.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$58.                                      | \$60.         | 8.00   | 4.50  | 1.90  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$60.                                      | \$62.         | 8.30   | 4.70  | 2.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$62.                                      | \$64.         | 8.60   | 5.00  | 2.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$64.                                      | \$66.         | 8.90   | 5.30  | 2.70  | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$66.                                      | \$68.         | 9.20   | 5.60  | 2.90  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$68.                                      | \$70.         | 9.40   | 6.00  | 3.10  | .60   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$70.                                      | \$72.         | 9.70   | 6.40  | 3.40  | .80   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$72.                                      | \$74.         | 10.00  | 6.70  | 3.60  | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$74.                                      | \$76.         | 10.30  | 7.10  | 3.90  | 1.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$76.                                      | \$78.         | 10.50  | 7.40  | 4.10  | 1.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$78.                                      | \$80.         | 10.80  | 7.80  | 4.30  | 1.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$80.                                      | \$82.         | 11.10  | 8.20  | 4.60  | 2.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$82.                                      | \$84.         | 11.40  | 8.40  | 4.80  | 2.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$84.                                      | \$86.         | 11.60  | 8.70  | 5.10  | 2.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$86.                                      | \$88.         | 11.90  | 9.00  | 5.40  | 2.70  | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$88.                                      | \$90.         | 12.20  | 9.30  | 5.80  | 3.00  | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$90.                                      | \$92.         | 12.40  | 9.50  | 6.10  | 3.20  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$92.                                      | \$94.         | 12.70  | 9.80  | 6.50  | 3.50  | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$94.                                      | \$96.         | 13.00  | 10.10 | 6.80  | 3.70  | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$96.                                      | \$98.         | 13.30  | 10.30 | 7.20  | 3.90  | 1.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$98.                                      | \$100.        | 13.50  | 10.60 | 7.60  | 4.20  | 1.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$100.                                     | \$102.        | 13.80  | 10.90 | 7.90  | 4.40  | 1.90  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$102.                                     | \$104.        | 14.10  | 11.20 | 8.20  | 4.70  | 2.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$104.                                     | \$106.        | 14.40  | 11.40 | 8.50  | 4.90  | 2.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$106.                                     | \$108.        | 14.60  | 11.70 | 8.80  | 5.10  | 2.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$108.                                     | \$110.        | 14.90  | 12.00 | 9.10  | 5.50  | 2.80  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$110.                                     | \$112.        | 15.20  | 12.30 | 9.30  | 5.90  | 3.10  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$112.                                     | \$114.        | 15.50  | 12.50 | 9.60  | 6.20  | 3.30  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$114.                                     | \$116.        | 15.70  | 12.80 | 9.90  | 6.60  | 3.50  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$116.                                     | \$118.        | 16.00  | 13.10 | 10.20 | 6.90  | 3.80  | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$118.                                     | \$120.        | 16.30  | 13.40 | 10.40 | 7.30  | 4.00  | 1.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$120.                                     | \$122.        | 16.70  | 13.80 | 10.80 | 7.80  | 4.40  | 1.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$122.                                     | \$124.        | 17.20  | 14.30 | 11.40 | 8.50  | 4.90  | 2.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$124.                                     | \$126.        | 17.80  | 14.90 | 11.90 | 9.00  | 5.40  | 2.80  | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$126.                                     | \$128.        | 18.30  | 15.40 | 12.50 | 9.60  | 6.20  | 3.30  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$128.                                     | \$130.        | 18.90  | 16.00 | 13.00 | 10.10 | 6.90  | 3.70  | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$130.                                     | \$132.        | 19.40  | 16.50 | 13.60 | 10.70 | 7.60  | 4.20  | 1.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$132.                                     | \$134.        | 20.00  | 17.00 | 14.10 | 11.20 | 8.30  | 4.70  | 2.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$134.                                     | \$136.        | 20.50  | 17.60 | 14.70 | 11.80 | 8.80  | 5.20  | 2.60  | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$136.                                     | \$138.        | 21.10  | 18.10 | 15.20 | 12.30 | 9.40  | 5.90  | 3.10  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$138.                                     | \$140.        | 21.60  | 18.70 | 15.80 | 12.80 | 9.90  | 6.60  | 3.60  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$140.                                     | \$142.        | 22.20  | 19.20 | 16.30 | 13.40 | 10.50 | 7.40  | 4.00  | 1.50  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$142.                                     | \$144.        | 22.70  | 19.80 | 16.90 | 13.90 | 11.00 | 8.10  | 4.50  | 2.00  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$144.                                     | \$146.        | 23.30  | 20.30 | 17.40 | 14.50 | 11.60 | 8.60  | 5.00  | 2.40  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$146.                                     | \$148.        | 23.80  | 20.90 | 18.00 | 15.00 | 12.10 | 9.20  | 5.70  | 2.90  | .40   | 0     | 0          |
| \$148.                                     | \$150.        | 24.40  | 21.40 | 18.50 | 15.60 | 12.70 | 9.70  | 6.40  | 3.40  | .80   | 0     | 0          |
| \$150.                                     | \$152.        | 24.90  | 22.00 | 19.10 | 16.10 | 13.20 | 10.30 | 7.10  | 3.90  | 1.30  | 0     | 0          |
| \$152.                                     | \$154.        | 25.40  | 22.60 | 19.60 | 16.70 | 13.80 | 10.80 | 7.80  | 4.40  | 1.80  | 0     | 0          |
| \$154.                                     | \$156.        | 26.00  | 23.10 | 20.10 | 17.20 | 14.30 | 11.40 | 8.50  | 4.80  | 2.30  | 0     | 0          |
| \$156.                                     | \$158.        | 26.50  | 23.60 | 20.70 | 17.80 | 14.80 | 11.90 | 9.00  | 5.40  | 2.80  | .20   | 0          |
| \$158.                                     | \$160.        | 27.10  | 24.20 | 21.20 | 18.30 | 15.40 | 12.50 | 9.50  | 6.10  | 3.20  | .70   | 0          |
| \$160.                                     | \$162.        | 28.00  | 25.10 | 22.20 | 19.30 | 16.40 | 13.40 | 10.50 | 7.40  | 4.10  | 1.50  | 0          |
| \$162.                                     | \$164.        | 29.40  | 26.50 | 23.60 | 20.60 | 17.70 | 14.80 | 11.90 | 9.00  | 5.40  | 2.70  | .20        |
| \$164.                                     | \$166.        | 30.80  | 27.90 | 24.90 | 22.00 | 19.10 | 16.20 | 13.20 | 10.30 | 7.20  | 3.90  | 1.40       |
| \$166.                                     | \$168.        | 32.10  | 29.20 | 26.30 | 23.40 | 20.50 | 17.50 | 14.60 | 11.70 | 8.80  | 5.10  | 2.60       |
| \$168.                                     | \$170.        | 33.50  | 30.60 | 27.70 | 24.70 | 21.80 | 18.90 | 16.00 | 13.10 | 10.10 | 6.90  | 3.70       |
| \$170.                                     | \$172.        | 34.90  | 32.00 | 29.00 | 26.10 | 23.20 | 20.30 | 17.30 | 14.40 | 11.50 | 8.60  | 4.90       |
| \$172.                                     | \$174.        | 36.30  | 33.30 | 30.40 | 27.50 | 24.60 | 21.60 | 18.70 | 15.80 | 12.90 | 9.90  | 6.70       |
| \$174.                                     | \$176.        | 37.60  | 34.70 | 31.80 | 28.90 | 25.90 | 23.00 | 20.10 | 17.20 | 14.20 | 11.30 | 8.40       |
| \$176.                                     | \$178.        | 39.00  | 36.10 | 33.10 | 30.20 | 27.30 | 24.40 | 21.40 | 18.50 | 15.60 | 12.70 | 9.80       |
| \$178.                                     | \$180.        | 40.40  | 37.40 | 34.50 | 31.60 | 28.70 | 25.70 | 22.80 | 19.90 | 17.00 | 14.00 | 11.10      |
| \$180.                                     | \$182.        | 42.40  | 39.50 | 36.60 | 33.60 | 30.70 | 27.80 | 24.90 | 21.90 | 19.00 | 16.10 | 13.20      |
| \$182.                                     | \$184.        | 45.10  | 42.20 | 39.30 | 36.40 | 33.50 | 30.50 | 27.60 | 24.70 | 21.80 | 18.80 | 15.90      |
| \$184.                                     | \$186.        | 47.90  | 45.00 | 42.00 | 39.10 | 36.20 | 33.30 | 30.30 | 27.40 | 24.50 | 21.60 | 18.60      |
| \$186.                                     | \$188.        | 50.60  | 47.70 | 44.80 | 41.80 | 38.90 | 36.00 | 33.10 | 30.20 | 27.20 | 24.30 | 21.40      |
| \$188.                                     | \$190.        | 53.40  | 50.40 | 47.50 | 44.60 | 41.70 | 38.70 | 35.80 | 32.90 | 30.00 | 27.00 | 24.10      |
| 14 percent of the excess over \$400 plus—  |               |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
| \$400 and over                             |               | 54.70  | 51.80 | 48.90 | 46.00 | 43.00 | 40.10 | 37.20 | 34.30 | 31.30 | 28.40 | 25.50"     |

*"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly—*

| And the wages are—                         |               | And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is— |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
|--|---------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| At least                                   | But less than | 0  | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10 or more |
| The amount of tax to be withheld shall be— |               |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
| \$0  | \$22          | 12% of wages   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0        |
| \$22                                       | \$24          | \$2.80   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$24                                       | \$26          | 3.00   | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$26                                       | \$28          | 3.20   | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$28                                       | \$30          | 3.50   | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$30                                       | \$32          | 3.70   | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$32                                       | \$34          | 4.00   | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$34                                       | \$36          | 4.20   | 1.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$36                                       | \$38          | 4.40   | 1.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$38                                       | \$40          | 4.70   | 1.90  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$40                                       | \$42          | 4.90   | 2.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$42                                       | \$44          | 5.10   | 2.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$44                                       | \$46          | 5.40   | 2.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$46                                       | \$48          | 5.70   | 2.90  | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$48                                       | \$50          | 6.00   | 3.10  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$50                                       | \$52          | 6.40   | 3.30  | .60   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$52                                       | \$54          | 6.70   | 3.60  | .80   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$54                                       | \$56          | 7.10   | 3.80  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$56                                       | \$58          | 7.50   | 4.10  | 1.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$58                                       | \$60          | 7.80   | 4.30  | 1.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$60                                       | \$62          | 8.20   | 4.50  | 1.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$62                                       | \$64          | 8.50   | 4.80  | 2.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$64                                       | \$66          | 8.90   | 5.00  | 2.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$66                                       | \$68          | 9.20   | 5.20  | 2.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$68                                       | \$70          | 9.40   | 5.50  | 2.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$70                                       | \$72          | 9.70   | 5.80  | 3.00  | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$72                                       | \$74          | 10.00  | 6.20  | 3.20  | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$74                                       | \$76          | 10.30  | 6.50  | 3.40  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$76                                       | \$78          | 10.50  | 6.90  | 3.70  | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$78                                       | \$80          | 10.80  | 7.30  | 4.00  | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$80                                       | \$82          | 11.10  | 7.60  | 4.30  | 1.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$82                                       | \$84          | 11.40  | 8.00  | 4.40  | 1.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$84                                       | \$86          | 11.60  | 8.30  | 4.60  | 1.90  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$86                                       | \$88          | 11.90  | 8.70  | 4.90  | 2.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$88                                       | \$90          | 12.20  | 9.00  | 5.10  | 2.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$90                                       | \$92          | 12.40  | 9.30  | 5.40  | 2.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$92                                       | \$94          | 12.70  | 9.60  | 5.60  | 2.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$94                                       | \$96          | 13.00  | 9.80  | 6.00  | 3.10  | .30   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$96                                       | \$98          | 13.30  | 10.10 | 6.30  | 3.30  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$98                                       | \$100         | 13.50  | 10.40 | 6.70  | 3.50  | .80   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$100                                      | \$102         | 13.80  | 10.70 | 7.10  | 3.80  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$102                                      | \$104         | 14.10  | 10.90 | 7.40  | 4.00  | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$104                                      | \$106         | 14.40  | 11.20 | 7.80  | 4.30  | 1.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$106                                      | \$108         | 14.60  | 11.50 | 8.10  | 4.50  | 1.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$108                                      | \$110         | 14.90  | 11.70 | 8.50  | 4.70  | 2.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$110                                      | \$112         | 15.20  | 12.00 | 8.90  | 5.00  | 2.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$112                                      | \$114         | 15.50  | 12.30 | 9.10  | 5.20  | 2.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$114                                      | \$116         | 15.70  | 12.60 | 9.40  | 5.50  | 2.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$116                                      | \$118         | 16.00  | 12.80 | 9.70  | 5.80  | 2.90  | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$118                                      | \$120         | 16.30  | 13.10 | 9.90  | 6.10  | 3.20  | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$120                                      | \$122         | 16.70  | 13.50 | 10.40 | 6.70  | 3.50  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$122                                      | \$124         | 17.20  | 14.10 | 10.90 | 7.40  | 4.00  | 1.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$124                                      | \$126         | 17.80  | 14.60 | 11.50 | 8.10  | 4.50  | 1.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$126                                      | \$128         | 18.30  | 15.20 | 12.00 | 8.80  | 5.00  | 2.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$128                                      | \$130         | 18.90  | 15.70 | 12.50 | 9.40  | 5.40  | 2.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$130                                      | \$132         | 19.40  | 16.30 | 13.10 | 9.90  | 6.10  | 3.10  | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$132                                      | \$134         | 20.00  | 16.80 | 13.60 | 10.50 | 6.80  | 3.60  | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$134                                      | \$136         | 20.50  | 17.40 | 14.20 | 11.00 | 7.50  | 4.10  | 1.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$136                                      | \$138         | 21.10  | 17.90 | 14.70 | 11.60 | 8.20  | 4.60  | 1.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$138                                      | \$140         | 21.60  | 18.40 | 15.30 | 12.10 | 8.90  | 5.10  | 2.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$140                                      | \$142         | 22.20  | 19.00 | 15.80 | 12.70 | 9.50  | 5.50  | 2.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$142                                      | \$144         | 22.70  | 19.50 | 16.40 | 13.20 | 10.00 | 6.30  | 3.20  | .50   | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$144                                      | \$146         | 23.30  | 20.10 | 16.90 | 13.80 | 10.60 | 7.00  | 3.70  | 1.00  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$146                                      | \$148         | 23.80  | 20.60 | 17.50 | 14.30 | 11.10 | 7.70  | 4.20  | 1.40  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$148                                      | \$150         | 24.40  | 21.20 | 18.00 | 14.90 | 11.70 | 8.40  | 4.70  | 1.90  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$150                                      | \$152         | 24.90  | 21.70 | 18.60 | 15.40 | 12.20 | 9.10  | 5.20  | 2.40  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$152                                      | \$154         | 25.40  | 22.30 | 19.10 | 15.90 | 12.80 | 9.60  | 5.70  | 2.90  | .10   | 0     | 0          |
| \$154                                      | \$156         | 26.00  | 22.80 | 19.70 | 16.50 | 13.30 | 10.20 | 6.40  | 3.30  | .60   | 0     | 0          |
| \$156                                      | \$158         | 26.50  | 23.40 | 20.20 | 17.00 | 13.90 | 10.70 | 7.10  | 3.80  | 1.10  | 0     | 0          |
| \$158                                      | \$160         | 27.10  | 23.90 | 20.80 | 17.60 | 14.40 | 11.30 | 7.80  | 4.30  | 1.50  | 0     | 0          |
| \$160                                      | \$162         | 28.00  | 24.90 | 21.70 | 18.50 | 15.40 | 12.20 | 9.00  | 5.10  | 2.40  | 0     | 0          |
| \$162                                      | \$164         | 29.40  | 26.20 | 23.10 | 19.90 | 16.70 | 13.60 | 10.40 | 6.70  | 3.60  | .80   | 0          |
| \$164                                      | \$166         | 30.80  | 27.60 | 24.40 | 21.30 | 18.10 | 14.90 | 11.80 | 8.50  | 4.80  | 2.00  | 0          |
| \$166                                      | \$168         | 32.10  | 29.00 | 25.80 | 22.60 | 19.50 | 16.30 | 13.10 | 10.00 | 6.20  | 3.20  | 0          |
| \$168                                      | \$170         | 33.50  | 30.30 | 27.20 | 24.00 | 20.80 | 17.70 | 14.50 | 11.30 | 8.00  | 4.40  | 1.60       |
| \$170                                      | \$172         | 34.90  | 31.70 | 28.60 | 25.40 | 22.20 | 19.10 | 15.90 | 12.70 | 9.60  | 5.60  | 2.80       |
| \$172                                      | \$174         | 36.30  | 33.10 | 29.90 | 26.80 | 23.60 | 20.40 | 17.30 | 14.10 | 10.90 | 7.40  | 4.00       |
| \$174                                      | \$176         | 37.60  | 34.50 | 31.30 | 28.10 | 25.00 | 21.80 | 18.60 | 15.50 | 12.30 | 9.10  | 5.20       |
| \$176                                      | \$178         | 39.00  | 35.80 | 32.70 | 29.50 | 26.30 | 23.20 | 20.00 | 16.80 | 13.70 | 10.50 | 6.80       |
| \$178                                      | \$180         | 40.40  | 37.20 | 34.00 | 30.90 | 27.70 | 24.50 | 21.40 | 18.20 | 15.00 | 11.90 | 8.60       |
| \$180                                      | \$182         | 42.40  | 39.20 | 36.10 | 32.90 | 29.70 | 26.60 | 23.40 | 20.20 | 17.10 | 13.90 | 10.70      |
| \$182                                      | \$184         | 44.10  | 42.00 | 38.80 | 35.60 | 32.50 | 29.30 | 26.10 | 23.00 | 19.80 | 16.60 | 13.50      |
| \$184                                      | \$186         | 47.90  | 44.70 | 41.50 | 38.40 | 35.20 | 32.00 | 28.90 | 25.70 | 22.50 | 19.40 | 16.20      |
| \$186                                      | \$188         | 50.60  | 47.40 | 44.30 | 41.10 | 37.90 | 34.80 | 31.60 | 28.40 | 25.30 | 22.10 | 18.90      |
| \$188                                      | \$190         | 53.40  | 50.20 | 47.00 | 43.90 | 40.70 | 37.50 | 34.40 | 31.20 | 28.00 | 24.90 | 21.70      |
| \$190                                      | \$192         | 56.10  | 52.90 | 49.80 | 46.60 | 43.40 | 40.30 | 37.10 | 33.90 | 30.80 | 27.60 | 24.40      |
| \$192                                      | \$194         | 58.80  | 55.70 | 52.50 | 49.30 | 46.20 | 43.00 | 39.80 | 36.70 | 33.50 | 30.30 | 27.20      |
| \$194                                      | \$196         | 61.60  | 58.40 | 55.20 | 52.10 | 48.90 | 45.70 | 42.60 | 39.40 | 36.20 | 33.10 | 29.90      |
| \$196                                      | \$198         | 64.30  | 61.10 | 58.00 | 54.80 | 51.60 | 48.50 | 45.30 | 42.10 | 39.00 | 35.80 | 32.60      |
| \$198                                      | \$200         | 67.00  | 63.90 | 60.70 | 57.50 | 54.40 | 51.20 | 48.00 | 44.90 | 41.70 | 38.50 | 35.40      |
| 14 percent of the excess over \$500 plus   |               |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
| \$500 and over                             |               | 68.40  | 65.20 | 62.10 | 58.90 | 55.70 | 52.60 | 49.40 | 46.20 | 43.10 | 39.90 | 36.70 "    |

*"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly—"*

| And the wages are—                         |               | And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is— |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
|--|---------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| At least                                   | But less than | 0  | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     | 7     | 8     | 9     | 10 or more |
| The amount of tax to be withheld shall be— |               |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |
| \$0.                                       | \$44.         | 12% of wages   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0   | \$0        |
| \$44.                                      | \$48.         | \$5.50   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$48.                                      | \$52.         | 6.00   | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$52.                                      | \$56.         | 6.50   | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$56.                                      | \$60.         | 6.90   | 1.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$60.                                      | \$64.         | 7.40   | 1.90  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$64.                                      | \$68.         | 7.90   | 2.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$68.                                      | \$72.         | 8.40   | 2.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$72.                                      | \$76.         | 8.90   | 3.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$76.                                      | \$80.         | 9.30   | 3.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$80.                                      | \$84.         | 9.80   | 4.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$84.                                      | \$88.         | 10.20  | 4.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$88.                                      | \$92.         | 10.80  | 5.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$92.                                      | \$96.         | 11.30  | 5.70  | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$96.                                      | \$100.        | 12.10  | 6.20  | .60   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$100.                                     | \$104.        | 12.80  | 6.70  | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$104.                                     | \$108.        | 13.50  | 7.10  | 1.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$108.                                     | \$112.        | 14.20  | 7.60  | 2.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$112.                                     | \$116.        | 14.90  | 8.10  | 2.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$116.                                     | \$120.        | 15.70  | 8.60  | 3.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$120.                                     | \$124.        | 16.40  | 9.10  | 3.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$124.                                     | \$128.        | 17.10  | 9.50  | 4.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$128.                                     | \$132.        | 17.80  | 10.00 | 4.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$132.                                     | \$136.        | 18.30  | 10.50 | 5.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$136.                                     | \$140.        | 18.90  | 11.00 | 5.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$140.                                     | \$144.        | 19.40  | 11.60 | 5.90  | .40   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$144.                                     | \$148.        | 20.00  | 12.40 | 6.40  | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$148.                                     | \$152.        | 20.50  | 13.10 | 6.90  | 1.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$152.                                     | \$156.        | 21.10  | 13.80 | 7.40  | 1.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$156.                                     | \$160.        | 21.60  | 14.50 | 7.80  | 2.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$160.                                     | \$164.        | 22.20  | 15.20 | 8.30  | 2.80  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$164.                                     | \$168.        | 22.70  | 16.00 | 8.80  | 3.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$168.                                     | \$172.        | 23.30  | 16.70 | 9.30  | 3.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$172.                                     | \$176.        | 23.80  | 17.40 | 9.70  | 4.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$176.                                     | \$180.        | 24.40  | 18.00 | 10.20 | 4.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$180.                                     | \$184.        | 24.90  | 18.60 | 10.70 | 5.20  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$184.                                     | \$188.        | 25.40  | 19.10 | 11.20 | 5.60  | .10   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$188.                                     | \$192.        | 26.00  | 19.70 | 12.00 | 6.10  | .60   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$192.                                     | \$196.        | 26.50  | 20.20 | 12.70 | 6.60  | 1.10  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$196.                                     | \$200.        | 27.10  | 20.80 | 13.40 | 7.10  | 1.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$200.                                     | \$204.        | 27.60  | 21.30 | 14.10 | 7.60  | 2.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$204.                                     | \$208.        | 28.20  | 21.80 | 14.80 | 8.00  | 2.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$208.                                     | \$212.        | 28.70  | 22.40 | 15.60 | 8.50  | 3.00  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$212.                                     | \$216.        | 29.30  | 22.90 | 16.30 | 9.00  | 3.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$216.                                     | \$220.        | 29.80  | 23.50 | 17.00 | 9.50  | 3.90  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$220.                                     | \$224.        | 30.40  | 24.00 | 17.70 | 9.90  | 4.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$224.                                     | \$228.        | 30.90  | 24.60 | 18.30 | 10.40 | 4.90  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$228.                                     | \$232.        | 31.50  | 25.10 | 18.80 | 10.90 | 5.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$232.                                     | \$236.        | 32.00  | 25.70 | 19.30 | 11.60 | 5.80  | .20   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$236.                                     | \$240.        | 32.60  | 26.20 | 19.90 | 12.30 | 6.30  | .80   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$240.                                     | \$244.        | 33.40  | 27.00 | 20.70 | 13.30 | 7.00  | 1.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$244.                                     | \$248.        | 34.50  | 28.10 | 21.80 | 14.80 | 8.00  | 2.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$248.                                     | \$256.        | 35.60  | 29.20 | 22.90 | 16.20 | 9.00  | 3.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$256.                                     | \$264.        | 36.70  | 30.30 | 24.00 | 17.70 | 9.90  | 4.40  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$264.                                     | \$272.        | 37.80  | 31.40 | 25.10 | 18.80 | 10.80 | 5.30  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$272.                                     | \$280.        | 38.90  | 32.50 | 26.20 | 19.90 | 12.20 | 6.30  | .70   | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$280.                                     | \$288.        | 39.90  | 33.60 | 27.30 | 20.90 | 13.60 | 7.20  | 1.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$288.                                     | \$296.        | 41.00  | 34.70 | 28.40 | 22.00 | 15.10 | 8.20  | 2.70  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$296.                                     | \$304.        | 42.10  | 35.80 | 29.50 | 23.10 | 16.50 | 9.20  | 3.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$304.                                     | \$312.        | 43.20  | 36.90 | 30.60 | 24.20 | 17.60 | 10.10 | 4.60  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$312.                                     | \$320.        | 44.30  | 38.00 | 31.70 | 25.30 | 19.00 | 11.10 | 5.50  | 0     | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$320.                                     | \$328.        | 45.40  | 39.10 | 32.80 | 26.40 | 20.10 | 12.50 | 6.50  | .90   | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$328.                                     | \$336.        | 46.50  | 40.20 | 33.80 | 27.50 | 21.20 | 14.00 | 7.40  | 1.90  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$336.                                     | \$344.        | 47.60  | 41.30 | 34.90 | 28.60 | 22.30 | 15.40 | 8.40  | 2.90  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$344.                                     | \$352.        | 48.70  | 42.40 | 36.00 | 29.70 | 23.40 | 16.80 | 9.40  | 3.80  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$352.                                     | \$360.        | 49.80  | 43.50 | 37.10 | 30.80 | 24.50 | 18.10 | 10.30 | 4.80  | 0     | 0     | 0          |
| \$360.                                     | \$368.        | 50.90  | 44.60 | 38.20 | 31.90 | 25.60 | 19.20 | 11.40 | 5.70  | .20   | 0     | 0          |
| \$368.                                     | \$376.        | 52.00  | 45.70 | 39.30 | 33.00 | 26.70 | 20.30 | 12.80 | 6.70  | 1.20  | 0     | 0          |
| \$376.                                     | \$384.        | 53.10  | 46.70 | 40.40 | 34.10 | 27.70 | 21.40 | 14.30 | 7.70  | 2.10  | 0     | 0          |
| \$384.                                     | \$392.        | 54.20  | 47.80 | 41.50 | 35.20 | 28.80 | 22.50 | 15.70 | 8.60  | 3.10  | 0     | 0          |
| \$392.                                     | \$400.        | 55.30  | 48.90 | 42.60 | 36.30 | 29.90 | 23.60 | 17.10 | 9.50  | 4.00  | 0     | 0          |
| \$400.                                     | \$408.        | 56.40  | 49.80 | 43.70 | 37.40 | 31.00 | 24.70 | 18.10 | 10.30 | 4.70  | 0     | 0          |
| \$408.                                     | \$416.        | 57.50  | 50.90 | 44.80 | 38.50 | 32.10 | 25.80 | 19.20 | 11.40 | 5.70  | 1.00  | 0          |
| \$416.                                     | \$424.        | 58.60  | 52.00 | 45.90 | 39.60 | 33.20 | 26.90 | 20.30 | 12.50 | 6.70  | 4.00  | 0          |
| \$424.                                     | \$432.        | 59.70  | 53.10 | 47.00 | 40.70 | 34.30 | 28.00 | 21.40 | 13.60 | 7.70  | 5.80  | .80        |
| \$432.                                     | \$440.        | 60.80  | 54.20 | 48.10 | 41.80 | 35.40 | 29.10 | 22.50 | 14.70 | 8.70  | 8.00  | 3.20       |
| \$440.                                     | \$448.        | 61.90  | 55.30 | 49.20 | 42.90 | 36.50 | 30.20 | 23.60 | 15.80 | 9.70  | 10.40 | 5.60       |
| \$448.                                     | \$456.        | 63.00  | 56.40 | 50.30 | 44.00 | 37.60 | 31.30 | 24.70 | 16.90 | 10.70 | 13.70 | 8.00       |
| \$456.                                     | \$464.        | 64.10  | 57.50 | 51.40 | 45.10 | 38.70 | 32.40 | 25.80 | 18.00 | 11.80 | 17.30 | 10.40      |
| \$464.                                     | \$472.        | 65.20  | 58.60 | 52.50 | 46.20 | 39.80 | 33.50 | 26.90 | 19.10 | 12.90 | 21.50 | 13.70      |
| \$472.                                     | \$480.        | 66.30  | 59.70 | 53.60 | 47.30 | 40.90 | 34.60 | 28.00 | 20.20 | 14.00 | 25.70 | 17.30      |
| \$480.                                     | \$488.        | 67.40  | 60.80 | 54.70 | 48.40 | 42.00 | 35.70 | 29.10 | 21.30 | 15.10 | 28.80 | 21.50      |
| \$488.                                     | \$496.        | 68.50  | 61.90 | 55.80 | 49.50 | 43.10 | 36.80 | 30.20 | 22.40 | 16.20 | 32.40 | 25.70      |
| \$496.                                     | \$504.        | 69.60  | 63.00 | 56.90 | 50.60 | 44.20 | 37.90 | 31.30 | 23.50 | 17.30 | 36.60 | 29.90      |
| \$504.                                     | \$512.        | 70.70  | 64.10 | 58.00 | 51.70 | 45.30 | 39.00 | 32.40 | 24.60 | 18.40 | 40.70 | 33.90      |
| \$512.                                     | \$520.        | 71.80  | 65.20 | 59.10 | 52.80 | 46.40 | 40.10 | 33.50 | 25.70 | 19.50 | 44.80 | 37.90      |
| \$520.                                     | \$528.        | 72.90  | 66.30 | 60.20 | 53.90 | 47.50 | 41.20 | 34.60 | 26.80 | 20.60 | 48.90 | 41.90      |
| \$528.                                     | \$536.        | 74.00  | 67.40 | 61.30 | 55.00 | 48.60 | 42.30 | 35.70 | 27.90 | 21.70 | 52.40 | 45.90      |
| \$536.                                     | \$544.        | 75.10  | 68.50 | 62.40 | 56.10 | 49.70 | 43.40 | 36.80 | 29.00 | 22.80 | 56.40 | 49.90      |
| \$544.                                     | \$552.        | 76.20  | 69.60 | 63.50 | 57.20 | 50.80 | 44.50 | 37.90 | 30.10 | 23.90 | 60.40 | 53.90      |
| \$552.                                     | \$560.        | 77.30  | 70.70 | 64.60 | 58.30 | 51.90 | 45.60 | 39.00 | 31.20 | 25.00 | 64.40 | 57.90      |
| \$560.                                     | \$568.        | 78.40  | 71.80 | 65.70 | 59.40 | 53.00 | 46.70 | 40.10 | 32.30 | 26.10 | 68.40 | 61.90      |
| \$568.                                     | \$576.        | 79.50  | 72.90 | 66.80 | 60.50 | 54.10 | 47.80 | 41.20 | 33.40 | 27.20 | 72.40 | 65.90      |
| \$57600.</                                 |               |  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |            |

*"If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period—*

| And the wages divided by the number of days in such periods are— |               | And the number of withholding exemptions claimed is—   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |
|--|---------------|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------------|
|  |               | 0  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6 +  | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10 or more |
| At least   | But less than | The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |            |
| \$0  | \$1.50        | 12% of wages   | \$0  | \$0  | \$0  | \$0  | \$0  | \$0  | \$0  | \$0  | \$0  | \$0        |
| \$1.50   | \$1.75        | \$0.20   | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$1.75   | \$2.00        | .25  | .05  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$2.00   | \$2.25        | .30  | .10  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$2.25   | \$2.50        | .35  | .15  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$2.50   | \$2.75        | .40  | .20  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$2.75   | \$3.00        | .45  | .25  | .05  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$3.00   | \$3.25        | .50  | .30  | .10  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$3.25   | \$3.50        | .55  | .35  | .15  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$3.50   | \$3.75        | .60  | .40  | .20  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$3.75   | \$4.00        | .65  | .45  | .25  | .05  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$4.00   | \$4.25        | .70  | .50  | .30  | .10  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$4.25   | \$4.50        | .75  | .55  | .35  | .15  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$4.50   | \$4.75        | .80  | .60  | .40  | .20  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$4.75   | \$5.00        | .85  | .65  | .45  | .25  | .05  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$5.00   | \$5.25        | .90  | .70  | .50  | .30  | .10  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$5.25   | \$5.50        | .95  | .75  | .55  | .35  | .15  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$5.50   | \$5.75        | 1.00   | .80  | .60  | .40  | .20  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$5.75   | \$6.00        | 1.05   | .85  | .65  | .45  | .25  | .05  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$6.00   | \$6.25        | 1.10   | .90  | .70  | .50  | .30  | .10  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$6.25   | \$6.50        | 1.15   | .95  | .75  | .55  | .35  | .15  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$6.50   | \$6.75        | 1.20   | 1.00 | .80  | .60  | .40  | .20  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$6.75   | \$7.00        | 1.25   | 1.05 | .85  | .65  | .45  | .25  | .05  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$7.00   | \$7.25        | 1.30   | 1.10 | .90  | .70  | .50  | .30  | .10  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$7.25   | \$7.50        | 1.35   | 1.15 | .95  | .75  | .55  | .35  | .15  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$7.50   | \$7.75        | 1.40   | 1.20 | 1.00 | .80  | .60  | .40  | .20  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$7.75   | \$8.00        | 1.45   | 1.25 | 1.05 | .85  | .65  | .45  | .25  | .05  | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$8.00   | \$8.25        | 1.50   | 1.30 | 1.10 | .90  | .70  | .50  | .30  | .10  | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$8.25   | \$8.50        | 1.55   | 1.35 | 1.15 | .95  | .75  | .55  | .35  | .15  | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$8.50   | \$8.75        | 1.60   | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.00 | .80  | .60  | .40  | .20  | 0    | 0    | 0          |
| \$8.75   | \$9.00        | 1.65   | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.05 | .85  | .65  | .45  | .25  | .05  | 0    | 0          |
| \$9.00   | \$9.25        | 1.70   | 1.50 | 1.30 | 1.10 | .90  | .70  | .50  | .30  | .10  | 0    | 0          |
| \$9.25   | \$9.50        | 1.75   | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.15 | .95  | .75  | .55  | .35  | .15  | 0    | 0          |
| \$9.50   | \$9.75        | 1.80   | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.00 | .80  | .60  | .40  | .20  | 0    | 0          |
| \$9.75   | \$10.00       | 1.85   | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.05 | .85  | .65  | .45  | .25  | .05  | 0          |
| \$10.00  | \$10.25       | 1.90   | 1.70 | 1.50 | 1.30 | 1.10 | .90  | .70  | .50  | .30  | .10  | 0          |
| \$10.25  | \$10.50       | 1.95   | 1.75 | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.15 | .95  | .75  | .55  | .35  | .15  | 0          |
| \$10.50  | \$10.75       | 2.00   | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.00 | .80  | .60  | .40  | .20  | 0          |
| \$10.75  | \$11.00       | 2.05   | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.05 | .85  | .65  | .45  | .25  | .05        |
| \$11.00  | \$11.25       | 2.10   | 1.90 | 1.70 | 1.50 | 1.30 | 1.10 | .90  | .70  | .50  | .30  | .10        |
| \$11.25  | \$11.50       | 2.15   | 1.95 | 1.75 | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.15 | .95  | .75  | .55  | .35  | .15        |
| \$11.50  | \$11.75       | 2.20   | 2.00 | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.00 | .80  | .60  | .40  | .20        |
| \$11.75  | \$12.00       | 2.25   | 2.05 | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.05 | .85  | .65  | .45  | .25        |
| \$12.00  | \$12.25       | 2.30   | 2.10 | 1.90 | 1.70 | 1.50 | 1.30 | 1.10 | .90  | .70  | .50  | .30        |
| \$12.25  | \$12.50       | 2.35   | 2.15 | 1.95 | 1.75 | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.15 | .95  | .75  | .55  | .35        |
| \$12.50  | \$12.75       | 2.40   | 2.20 | 2.00 | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.00 | .80  | .60  | .40        |
| \$12.75  | \$13.00       | 2.45   | 2.25 | 2.05 | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.05 | .85  | .65  | .45        |
| \$13.00  | \$13.25       | 2.50   | 2.30 | 2.10 | 1.90 | 1.70 | 1.50 | 1.30 | 1.10 | .90  | .70  | .50        |
| \$13.25  | \$13.50       | 2.55   | 2.35 | 2.15 | 1.95 | 1.75 | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.15 | .95  | .75  | .55        |
| \$13.50  | \$13.75       | 2.60   | 2.40 | 2.20 | 2.00 | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.00 | .80  | .60        |
| \$13.75  | \$14.00       | 2.65   | 2.45 | 2.25 | 2.05 | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.05 | .85  | .65        |
| \$14.00  | \$14.25       | 2.70   | 2.50 | 2.30 | 2.10 | 1.90 | 1.70 | 1.50 | 1.30 | 1.10 | .90  | .70        |
| \$14.25  | \$14.50       | 2.75   | 2.55 | 2.35 | 2.15 | 1.95 | 1.75 | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.15 | .95  | .75        |
| \$14.50  | \$14.75       | 2.80   | 2.60 | 2.40 | 2.20 | 2.00 | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.00 | .80        |
| \$14.75  | \$15.00       | 2.85   | 2.65 | 2.45 | 2.25 | 2.05 | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.05 | .85        |
| \$15.00  | \$15.25       | 2.90   | 2.70 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 2.10 | 1.90 | 1.70 | 1.50 | 1.30 | 1.10 | .90        |
| \$15.25  | \$15.50       | 2.95   | 2.75 | 2.55 | 2.35 | 2.15 | 1.95 | 1.75 | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.15 | .95        |
| \$15.50  | \$15.75       | 3.00   | 2.80 | 2.60 | 2.40 | 2.20 | 2.00 | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 1.00       |
| \$15.75  | \$16.00       | 3.05   | 2.85 | 2.65 | 2.45 | 2.25 | 2.05 | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.05       |
| \$16.00  | \$16.25       | 3.10   | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 2.10 | 1.90 | 1.70 | 1.50 | 1.30 | 1.10       |
| \$16.25  | \$16.50       | 3.15   | 2.95 | 2.75 | 2.55 | 2.35 | 2.15 | 1.95 | 1.75 | 1.55 | 1.35 | 1.15       |
| \$16.50  | \$16.75       | 3.20   | 3.00 | 2.80 | 2.60 | 2.40 | 2.20 | 2.00 | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.40 | 1.20       |
| \$16.75  | \$17.00       | 3.25   | 3.05 | 2.85 | 2.65 | 2.45 | 2.25 | 2.05 | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45 | 1.25       |
| \$17.00  | \$17.25       | 3.30   | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 2.10 | 1.90 | 1.70 | 1.50 | 1.30       |
| \$17.25  | \$17.50       | 3.35   | 3.15 | 2.95 | 2.75 | 2.55 | 2.35 | 2.15 | 1.95 | 1.75 | 1.55 | 1.35       |
| \$17.50  | \$17.75       | 3.40   | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 2.60 | 2.40 | 2.20 | 2.00 | 1.80 | 1.60 | 1.40       |
| \$17.75  | \$18.00       | 3.45   | 3.25 | 3.05 | 2.85 | 2.65 | 2.45 | 2.25 | 2.05 | 1.85 | 1.65 | 1.45       |
| \$18.00  | \$18.25       | 3.50   | 3.30 | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 2.10 | 1.90 | 1.70 | 1.50       |
| \$18.25  | \$18.50       | 3.55   | 3.35 | 3.15 | 2.95 | 2.75 | 2.55 | 2.35 | 2.15 | 1.95 | 1.75 | 1.55       |
| \$18.50  | \$18.75       | 3.60   | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 2.60 | 2.40 | 2.20 | 2.00 | 1.80 | 1.60       |
| \$18.75  | \$19.00       | 3.65   | 3.45 | 3.25 | 3.05 | 2.85 | 2.65 | 2.45 | 2.25 | 2.05 | 1.85 | 1.65       |
| \$19.00  | \$19.25       | 3.70   | 3.50 | 3.30 | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 2.10 | 1.90 | 1.70       |
| \$19.25  | \$19.50       | 3.75   | 3.55 | 3.35 | 3.15 | 2.95 | 2.75 | 2.55 | 2.35 | 2.15 | 1.95 | 1.75       |
| \$19.50  | \$19.75       | 3.80   | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 2.60 | 2.40 | 2.20 | 2.00 | 1.80       |
| \$19.75  | \$20.00       | 3.85   | 3.65 | 3.45 | 3.25 | 3.05 | 2.85 | 2.65 | 2.45 | 2.25 | 2.05 | 1.85       |
| \$20.00  | \$20.25       | 3.90   | 3.70 | 3.50 | 3.30 | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 2.10 | 1.90       |
| \$20.25  | \$20.50       | 3.95   | 3.75 | 3.55 | 3.35 | 3.15 | 2.95 | 2.75 | 2.55 | 2.35 | 2.15 | 1.95       |
| \$20.50  | \$20.75       | 4.00   | 3.80 | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 2.60 | 2.40 | 2.20 | 2.00       |
| \$20.75  | \$21.00       | 4.05   | 3.85 | 3.65 | 3.45 | 3.25 | 3.05 | 2.85 | 2.65 | 2.45 | 2.25 | 2.05       |
| \$21.00  | \$21.25       | 4.10   | 3.90 | 3.70 | 3.50 | 3.30 | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.50 | 2.30 | 2.10       |
| \$21.25  | \$21.50       | 4.15   | 3.95 | 3.75 | 3.55 | 3.35 | 3.15 | 2.95 | 2.75 | 2.55 | 2.35 | 2.15       |
| \$21.50  | \$21.75       | 4.20   | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 2.60 | 2.40 | 2.20       |
| \$21.75  | \$22.00       | 4.25   | 4.05 | 3.85 | 3.65 | 3.45 | 3.25 | 3.05 | 2.85 | 2.65 | 2.45 | 2.25       |
| \$22.00  | \$22.25       | 4.30   | 4.10 | 3.90 | 3.70 | 3.50 | 3.30 | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.50 | 2.30       |
| \$22.25  | \$22.50       | 4.35   | 4.15 | 3.95 | 3.75 | 3.55 | 3.35 | 3.15 | 2.95 | 2.75 | 2.55 | 2.35       |
| \$22.50  | \$22.75       | 4.40   | 4.20 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 2.60 | 2.40       |
| \$22.75  | \$23.00       | 4.45   | 4.25 | 4.05 | 3.85 | 3.65 | 3.45 | 3.25 | 3.05 | 2.85 | 2.65 | 2.45       |
| \$23.00  | \$23.25       | 4.50   | 4.30 | 4.10 | 3.90 | 3.70 | 3.50 | 3.30 | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.70 | 2.50       |
| \$23.25  | \$23.50       | 4.55   | 4.35 | 4.15 | 3.95 | 3.75 | 3.55 | 3.35 | 3.15 | 2.95 | 2.75 | 2.55       |
| \$23.50  | \$23.75       | 4.60   | 4.40 | 4.20 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 2.60       |
| \$23.75  | \$24.00       | 4.65   | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.05 | 3.85 | 3.65 | 3.45 | 3.25 | 3.05 | 2.85 | 2.65       |
| \$24.00  | \$24.25       | 4.70   | 4.50 | 4.30 | 4.10 | 3.90 | 3.70 | 3.50 | 3.30 | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.70       |
| \$24.25  | \$24.50       | 4.75   | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.15 | 3.95 | 3.75 | 3.55 | 3.35 | 3.15 | 2.95 | 2.75       |
| \$24.50  | \$24.75       | 4.80   | 4.60 | 4.40 | 4.20 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.20 | 3.00 | 2.80       |
| \$24.75  | \$25.00       | 4.85   | 4.65 | 4.45 | 4.25 | 4.05 | 3.85 | 3.65 | 3.45 | 3.25 | 3.05 |            |

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FORAND moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 3950, to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'Individual Income Tax Reduction Act of 1947.'"

"Sec. 2. Increase in Personal Exemptions.

"Section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits of individual against net income) is hereby amended by striking out '\$500,' wherever appearing therein, and by inserting in lieu thereof '\$600,' and by striking '\$1,000' and by inserting in lieu thereof '\$1,200.'"

"Sec. 3. Reduction in Surtax on Individuals.

"Section 12 (b) of Internal Revenue Code (relating to rates of surtax) is amended by striking out the tax table contained therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

| "If the surtax net income is:        | The tentative surtax shall be:                     |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Not over \$2,000--                   | 14 percent of the surtax net income.               |
| Over \$2,000 but not over \$4,000.   | \$280, plus 16 percent of excess over \$2,000.     |
| Over \$4,000 but not over \$6,000.   | \$600, plus 20 percent of excess over \$4,000.     |
| Over \$6,000 but not over \$8,000.   | \$1,000, plus 24 percent of excess over \$6,000.   |
| Over \$8,000 but not over \$10,000.  | \$1,480, plus 28 percent of excess over \$8,000.   |
| Over \$10,000 but not over \$12,000. | \$2,040, plus 32 percent of excess over \$10,000.  |
| Over \$12,000 but not over \$14,000. | \$2,680, plus 37 percent of excess over \$12,000.  |
| Over \$14,000 but not over \$16,000. | \$3,420, plus 41 percent of excess over \$14,000.  |
| Over \$16,000 but not over \$18,000. | \$4,240, plus 44 percent of excess over \$16,000.  |
| Over \$18,000 but not over \$20,000. | \$5,120, plus 47 percent of excess over \$18,000.  |
| Over \$20,000 but not over \$22,000. | \$6,060, plus 50 percent of excess over \$20,000.  |
| Over \$22,000 but not over \$26,000. | \$7,060, plus 53 percent of excess over \$22,000.  |
| Over \$26,000 but not over \$32,000. | \$9,180, plus 56 percent of excess over \$26,000.  |
| Over \$32,000 but not over \$38,000. | \$12,540, plus 59 percent of excess over \$32,000. |
| Over \$38,000 but not over \$44,000. | \$16,080, plus 63 percent of excess over \$38,000. |
| Over \$44,000 but not over \$50,000. | \$19,860, plus 66 percent of excess over \$44,000. |
| Over \$50,000 but not over \$60,000. | \$23,820, plus 69 percent of excess over \$50,000. |
| Over \$60,000 but not over \$70,000. | \$30,720, plus 72 percent of excess over \$60,000. |
| Over \$70,000 but not over \$80,000. | \$37,920, plus 75 percent of excess over \$70,000. |
| Over \$80,000 but not over \$90,000. | \$45,420, plus 78 percent of excess over \$80,000. |

"If the surtax net income is: The tentative surtax shall be:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Over \$90,000 but not over \$100,000.  | \$53,220, plus 81 percent of excess over \$90,000.    |
| Over \$100,000 but not over \$150,000. | \$61,320, plus 83 percent of excess over \$100,000.   |
| Over \$150,000 but not over \$200,000. | \$102,820, plus 84 percent of excess over \$150,000.  |
| Over \$200,000----                     | \$144,820, plus 85 percent of excess over \$200,000." |

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make such changes in the tables in section 400 (optional tax table) and section 1622 (withholding tables) as may be necessary to reflect the reduction in taxes provided for in the preceding provisions of this act.

"SEC. 4. The amendments to the Internal Revenue Code made by this act shall become effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 261, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—151

|               |                 |                |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abernethy     | Folger          | Marcantonio    |
| Albert        | Forand          | Miller, Calif. |
| Allen, La.    | Gary            | Mills          |
| Andrews, Ala. | Gordon          | Morgan         |
| Barden        | Gore            | Morris         |
| Bates, Ky.    | Gorski          | Morrison       |
| Battle        | Gossett         | Murdock        |
| Beckworth     | Granger         | Murray, Tenn.  |
| Blatnik       | Grant, Ala.     | Norrell        |
| Bloom         | Gregory         | Norton         |
| Boggs, La.    | Hardy           | O'Brien        |
| Bonner        | Harless, Ariz.  | O'Konski       |
| Brooks        | Harris          | Peden          |
| Brown, Ga.    | Harrison        | Peterson       |
| Bryson        | Hart            | Pfeifer        |
| Buchanan      | Havener         | Price, Fla.    |
| Buckley       | Hébert          | Price, Ill.    |
| Bulwini       | Hedrick         | Priest         |
| Burleson      | Heffernan       | Robin          |
| Byrne, N. Y.  | Hendricks       | Rains          |
| Camp          | Hobbs           | Rankin         |
| Cannon        | Huber           | Rayburn        |
| Carroll       | Jackson, Wash.  | Rayfield       |
| Celler        | Jarman          | Redden         |
| Chapman       | Johnson, Okla.  | Richards       |
| Chelf         | Jones, Ala.     | Riley          |
| Clements      | Jones, N. C.    | Rogers, Fla.   |
| Colmer        | Karsten, Mo.    | Rooney         |
| Cooper        | Kee             | Sabath         |
| Courtney      | Kefauver        | Sadowski       |
| Cox           | Kennedy         | Sasser         |
| Cravens       | Keogh           | Sheppard       |
| Crosser       | Kerr            | Sikes          |
| Davis, Ga.    | King            | Smathers       |
| Dawson, Ill.  | Kirwan          | Somers         |
| Dawson, Utah  | Klein           | Spence         |
| Deane         | Lane            | Stigler        |
| Delaney       | Lanham          | Teague         |
| Dingell       | Larcade         | Thomason       |
| Domengeaux    | Lea             | Thomson        |
| Donohue       | Lesinski        | Walter         |
| Doughton      | Lucas           | West           |
| Drewry        | Lusk            | Whitten        |
| Durham        | Lyle            | Whittington    |
| Eberhart      | Lynch           | Williams       |
| Elliott       | McCormack       | Wilson, Tex.   |
| Engle, Calif. | McMillan, S. C. | Winstead       |
| Evins         | Madden          | Wood           |
| Feighan       | Manasco         | Worley         |
| Fisher        | Mansfield,      | Zimmerman      |
| Fogarty       | Mont.           |                |

NAYS—261

|                  |                 |                  |
|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Allen, Calif.    | Graham          | Morton           |
| Allen, Ill.      | Grant, Ind.     | Muhlenberg       |
| Almond           | Griffiths       | Mundt            |
| Andersen         | Gross           | Murray, Wis.     |
| H. Carl          | Gwynn, N. Y.    | Nixon            |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gwynne, Iowa    | Nodar            |
| Andresen         | Hagen           | Norblad          |
| August H.        | Hale            | O'Hara           |
| Andrews, N. Y.   | Hall            | O'Toole          |
| Angell           | Edwin Arthur    | Owens            |
| Arends           | Hall            | Pace             |
| Arnold           | Leonard W.      | Passman          |
| Auchincloss      | Halleck         | Patman           |
| Bakewell         | Hand            | Patterson        |
| Banta            | Harness, Ind.   | Philbin          |
| Barrett          | Hartley         | Phillips, Calif. |
| Bates, Mass.     | Hays            | Phillips, Tenn.  |
| Beall            | Herter          | Pickett          |
| Bell             | Heslton         | Ploeser          |
| Bender           | Hess            | Plumley          |
| Bennett, Mich.   | Hill            | Poage            |
| Bennett, Mo.     | Hinshaw         | Potts            |
| Bishop           | Hoeven          | Preston          |
| Blackney         | Hoffman         | Ramey            |
| Boggs, Del.      | Hollifield      | Reed, Ill.       |
| Boykin           | Holmes          | Reed, N. Y.      |
| Bradley          | Hope            | Rees             |
| Bramblett        | Horan           | Reeves           |
| Brehm            | Howell          | Rich             |
| Brophy           | Hull            | Richman          |
| Brown, Ohio      | Jackson, Calif. | Rivers           |
| Buck             | Javits          | Rizley           |
| Buffett          | Jenison         | Robertson        |
| Burke            | Jenkins, Ohio   | Robison          |
| Busbey           | Jenkins, Pa.    | Rockwell         |
| Butler           | Jennings        | Rogers, Mass.    |
| Byrnes, Wis.     | Jensen          | Rohrbough        |
| Canfield         | Johnson, Calif. | Ross             |
| Carson           | Johnson, Ill.   | Russell          |
| Case, N. J.      | Johnson, Ind.   | Sadlak           |
| Case, S. Dak.    | Johnson, Tex.   | St. George       |
| Chadwick         | Jones, Ohio     | Sanborn          |
| Chenoweth        | Jones, Wash.    | Sarbacher        |
| Chilperfield     | Jonkman         | Schwabe, Mo.     |
| Church           | Judd            | Schwabe, Okla.   |
| Clark            | Kean            | Scoblick         |
| Clason           | Kearney         | Scott, Hardie    |
| Clevenger        | Kearns          | Scott,           |
| Clippinger       | Keating         | Hugh D., Jr.     |
| Coffin           | Keefe           | Scrivner         |
| Cole, Kans.      | Kersten, Wis.   | Seely-Brown      |
| Combs            | Kilburn         | Shafer           |
| Cooley           | Kilday          | Simpson, Ill.    |
| Corbett          | Knutson         | Simpson, Pa.     |
| Cotton           | Kunkel          | Smith, Kans.     |
| Crawford         | Landis          | Smith, Maine     |
| Crow             | Latham          | Smith, Va.       |
| Cunningham       | LeCompte        | Smith, Wis.      |
| Curtis           | LeFevre         | Snyder           |
| Dague            | Lemke           | Springer         |
| Davis, Wis.      | Lewis           | Stanley          |
| Devitt           | Lodge           | Stefan           |
| D'Ewart          | Love            | Stevenson        |
| Dirksen          | McConnell       | Stockman         |
| Dooliver         | McCowan         | Stratton         |
| Dondero          | McDonough       | Sundstrom        |
| Douglas          | McDowell        | Taber            |
| Eaton            | McGarvey        | Talle            |
| Ellis            | McGregor        | Taylor           |
| Ellsworth        | McMahon         | Thomas, N. J.    |
| Elsaesser        | McMillen, Ill.  | Tibbott          |
| Elston           | Mack            | Tollefson        |
| Engel, Mich.     | MacKinnon       | Towe             |
| Fallon           | Macy            | Trimble          |
| Fellows          | Mahon           | Twyman           |
| Fenton           | Maloney         | Vail             |
| Flannagan        | Martin, Iowa    | Van Zandt        |
| Fletcher         | Mason           | Vorys            |
| Foot             | Mathews         | Vursell          |
| Fulton           | Meade, Ky.      | Wadsworth        |
| Gallagher        | Meade, Md.      | Weichel          |
| Gamble           | Morrow          | Welch            |
| Gathings         | Meyer           | Wigglesworth     |
| Gavin            | Michener        | Wilson, Ind.     |
| Gearhart         | Miller, Conn.   | Wolcott          |
| Gillette         | Miller, Md.     | Wolverton        |
| Gillie           | Miller, Nebr.   | Woodruff         |
| Goff             | Mitchell        | Youngblood       |
| Goodwin          | Monroney        |                  |

NOT VOTING—18

|              |                 |              |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Bland        | Dorn            | Poulson      |
| Bolton       | Fernandez       | Powell       |
| Cole, Mo.    | Fuller          | Short        |
| Cole, N. Y.  | Gifford         | Smith, Ohio  |
| Coudert      | Kelley          | Thomas, Tex. |
| Davis, Tenn. | Mansfield, Tex. | Vinson       |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Powell for, with Mrs. Bolton against.  
Mr. Kelley for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.  
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Bland against.  
Mr. Mansfield of Texas for, with Mr. Short against.  
Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Cole of Missouri against.  
Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Coudert against.  
Mr. Fernandez for, with Mr. Gifford against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Thomas of Texas.

Messrs. COOLEY and BELL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 112, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—302

|                  |                |                 |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Allen, Calif.    | Cravens        | Harness, Ind.   |
| Allen, Ill.      | Crawford       | Harris          |
| Allen, La.       | Crow           | Harrison        |
| Almond           | Cunningham     | Hart            |
| Anderson, Calif. | Curtis         | Hartley         |
| Andersen         | Dague          | Hébert          |
| August H.        | Davis, Ga.     | Hedrick         |
| Andrews, N. Y.   | Davis, Wis.    | Hendricks       |
| Angell           | Dawson, Utah   | Herter          |
| Arends           | Devitt         | Heseltun        |
| Arnold           | D'Ewart        | Hess            |
| Auchincloss      | Dirksen        | Hill            |
| Bakewell         | Dolliver       | Hinshaw         |
| Banta            | Domengeaux     | Hoeven          |
| Barden           | Dondero        | Hoffman         |
| Barrett          | Donohue        | Holmes          |
| Bates, Mass.     | Doughton       | Hope            |
| Battle           | Durham         | Horan           |
| Beall            | Eaton          | Howell          |
| Bender           | Elliot         | Jackson, Calif. |
| Bennett, Mich.   | Ellis          | Javits          |
| Bennett, Mo.     | Ellsworth      | Jenison         |
| Bishop           | Eisnesser      | Jenkins, Ohio   |
| Blackney         | Elston         | Jenkins, Pa.    |
| Boggs, Del.      | Engel, Mich.   | Jennings        |
| Bonner           | Engle, Calif.  | Jensen          |
| Boykin           | Fallon         | Johnson, Calif. |
| Bradley          | Fellows        | Johnson, Ill.   |
| Brasblett        | Fenton         | Johnson, Ind.   |
| Brehm            | Fisher         | Jones, N. C.    |
| Brooks           | Fletcher       | Jones, Ohio     |
| Brophy           | Fogarty        | Jones, Wash.    |
| Brown, Ga.       | Foot           | Jonkman         |
| Brown, Ohio      | Fulton         | Judd            |
| Buck             | Gallagher      | Kean            |
| Buffett          | Gamble         | Kearney         |
| Bulwinkle        | Gary           | Kearns          |
| Burke            | Gathings       | Keating         |
| Busbey           | Gavin          | Keefe           |
| Butler           | Gearhart       | Kefauver        |
| Byrnes, Wis.     | Gillette       | Keogh           |
| Canfield         | Gillie         | Kerr            |
| Carson           | Goff           | Kersten, Wis.   |
| Case, N. J.      | Goodwin        | Kilburn         |
| Case, S. Dak.    | Gossett        | Kilday          |
| Chadwick         | Graham         | Knutson         |
| Chapman          | Grant, Ind.    | Kunkel          |
| Chelf            | Griffiths      | Landis          |
| Chenoweth        | Gross          | Lane            |
| Chiperfield      | Gwynn, N. Y.   | Larcade         |
| Church           | Gwynne, Iowa   | Latham          |
| Clason           | Hagen          | Lea             |
| Clements         | Hale           | LeCompte        |
| Clevenger        | Hall           | LeFevre         |
| Clippinger       | Edwin Arthur   | Lemke           |
| Coffin           | Hall           | Lewis           |
| Cole, Kans.      | Leonard W.     | Lodge           |
| Corbett          | Halleck        | Love            |
| Cotton           | Hand           | Lucas           |
| Cox              | Harless, Ariz. | McConnell       |

|                 |                  |               |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
| McCowan         | Peterson         | Seely-Brown   |
| McDonough       | Philbin          | Shafer        |
| McDowell        | Phillips, Calif. | Sikes         |
| McGarvey        | Phillips, Tenn.  | Simpson, Ill. |
| McGregor        | Ploeser          | Simpson, Pa.  |
| McMahon         | Plumley          | Smith, Kans.  |
| McMillan, S. C. | Potts            | Smith, Maine  |
| McMillen, Ill.  | Poulson          | Smith, Wis.   |
| Mack            | Preston          | Snyder        |
| MacKinnon       | Price, Fla.      | Springer      |
| Macy            | Ramey            | Stanley       |
| Maloney         | Rankin           | Stefan        |
| Martin, Iowa    | Redden           | Stevenson     |
| Mason           | Reed, Ill.       | Stockman      |
| Mathews         | Reed, N. Y.      | Stratton      |
| Meade, Ky.      | Rees             | Sundstrom     |
| Meade, Md.      | Reeves           | Taber         |
| Morrow          | Rich             | Talle         |
| Meyer           | Riehlman         | Taylor        |
| Michener        | Riley            | Thomas, N. J. |
| Miller, Conn.   | Rivers           | Tibbott       |
| Miller, Md.     | Rizley           | Tolkeison     |
| Miller, Nebr.   | Robertson        | Towe          |
| Mills           | Robison          | Twyman        |
| Mitchell        | Rockwell         | Val           |
| Morrison        | Rogers, Fla.     | Van Zandt     |
| Morton          | Rogers, Mass.    | Vorys         |
| Muhlenberg      | Rohrbough        | Vurcel        |
| Mundt           | Ross             | Wadsworth     |
| Murray, Tenn.   | Russell          | Weichel       |
| Murray, Wis.    | Sadlak           | Welch         |
| Nixon           | St. George       | West          |
| Nodar           | Sanborn          | Wheler        |
| Norblad         | Sarbacher        | Whittington   |
| Norrell         | Sasser           | Wigglesworth  |
| O'Brien         | Schwabe, Mo.     | Wilson, Ind.  |
| O'Hara          | Schwabe, Okla.   | Wilson, Tex.  |
| O'Konski        | Seoblick         | Wolcott       |
| O'Toole         | Scott, Hardie    | Wolverton     |
| Owens           | Scott            | Wood          |
| Passman         | Hugh D., Jr.     | Woodruff      |
| Patterson       | Scrivner         | Youngblood    |

NAYS—112

|               |                |                |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Abernethy     | Folger         | Marcanonio     |
| Albert        | Forand         | Miller, Calif. |
| Andersen      | Gordon         | Monroney       |
| H. Carl       | Gore           | Morgan         |
| Andrews, Ala. | Gorski         | Morris         |
| Bates, Ky.    | Granger        | Murdock        |
| Beckworth     | Grant, Ala.    | Norton         |
| Bell          | Gregory        | Pace           |
| Blatnik       | Hardy          | Patman         |
| Bloom         | Havenner       | Peden          |
| Boggs, La.    | Hays           | Pfeifer        |
| Bryson        | Heffernan      | Pickett        |
| Buchanan      | Hobbs          | Poage          |
| Buckley       | Holfield       | Price, Ill.    |
| Burleson      | Huber          | Priest         |
| Byrne, N. Y.  | Hull           | Rabin          |
| Camp          | Jackson, Wash. | Rains          |
| Cannon        | Jarman         | Rayburn        |
| Carroll       | Johnson, Okla. | Rayfield       |
| Celler        | Johnson, Tex.  | Richards       |
| Clark         | Jones, Ala.    | Rooney         |
| Colmer        | Karsten, Mo.   | Sabath         |
| Combs         | Kee            | Sadowski       |
| Cooley        | Kennedy        | Sheppard       |
| Cooper        | King           | Smathers       |
| Courtney      | Kirwan         | Smith, Va.     |
| Crosser       | Klein          | Somers         |
| Dawson, Ill.  | Lanham         | Spence         |
| Deane         | Lesinski       | Stigler        |
| Delaney       | Lusk           | Teague         |
| Dingell       | Lyle           | Thomason       |
| Douglas       | Lynch          | Trimble        |
| Drewry        | McCormack      | Walter         |
| Eberhart      | Madden         | Whitten        |
| Evins         | Mahon          | Williams       |
| Feighan       | Manasco        | Winstead       |
| Fernandez     | Mansfield,     | Worley         |
| Flannagan     | Mont.          | Zimmerman      |

NOT VOTING—16

|              |                 |              |
|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Bland        | Dorn            | Short        |
| Bolton       | Fuller          | Smith, Ohio  |
| Cole, Mo.    | Gifford         | Thomas, Tex. |
| Cole, N. Y.  | Kelley          | Vinson       |
| Coudert      | Mansfield, Tex. |              |
| Davis, Tenn. | Powell          |              |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Thomas of Texas for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Mr. Bland for, with Mr. Mansfield of Texas against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Vinson.  
Mr. Short with Mr. Dorn.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed, H. R. 3950.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he previously made, and include a certain table.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a graph.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain tables.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include an article.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made last Sunday.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to include in his extension of remarks, pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson], several newspaper excerpts and an excerpt from a letter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two separate and distinct articles.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio statement.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from articles.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) asked and was given permission

to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Government Corporation Bill.

#### CONSIDERATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to take up for consideration the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman consulted the ranking minority member of the subcommittee?

Mr. HALLECK. I spoke to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and he said it was satisfactory to him. I also spoke to the minority leader.

Mr. CANNON. All points of order have been reserved?

Mr. HALLECK. That has been taken care of already.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, but I would like to know whether this will interfere with the report of the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. We expect to call that up today.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement appearing in the Manufacturer.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3123, an act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees:

MESSRS. JONES of Ohio, JENSEN, FENTON, STOCKMAN, CASE of South Dakota, KIRWAN, ROONEY, GORE, and NORRELL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. I note that the name of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is included as one of the conferees. In view of the fact that the gentleman from South Dakota is not a member of the subcommittee and has never attended any of the hearings, and was not present when the bill was marked up, I am at a loss to know on what grounds he has been appointed a member of the conference committee. To include the gentleman from South Dakota, under the circumstances, is in contravention of the long-established custom of the House. I have never known it to be done, without approval of the minority, in the last quarter of a century. Why the departure from precedent on this particular occasion?

The SPEAKER. Because it is in the discretion of the Chair to make the appointments of the members of the committee.

#### ANDREW W. MELLON MEMORIAL

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 170) authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "at", and insert "in the vicinity of."

Page 1, line 8, after "design", insert "and location."

Page 1, line 10, after "Arts", insert "and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, as the resolution passed the House, the location of the memorial was at the intersection of Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Avenue in front of the Mellon Art Gallery. As it is now amended by the Senate the location is stated to be "in the vicinity of," so that in case it is planned to build a traffic underpass there, it can be constructed without interference. In addition, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission have been added so that the design will meet with their approval, as well as the approval of the National Commission on Fine Arts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I reserve the reservation of objection for the purpose of having a proper statement made for the RECORD.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And this is without expense to the Government.

Mr. FULTON. The construction of the proposed memorial is purely by public subscription and without expense to the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(s) The word 'resident' means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than seven months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. In the case of any resident who is an elective or appointive officer or an employee of the Government of the United States, and who is domiciled outside the District during the whole of the taxable year, there shall be excluded from the gross income of such resident salaries or wages received from the Government of the United States for services rendered as such officer or employee, and income derived from sources without the District. For the purposes of this Act the domicile of such officer or employee for any taxable year shall be in the State which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile: *Provided*, That he shall have had a domicile in such State under the laws of such State immediately prior to the beginning of the taxable year for which the tax is claimed. Such declaration must be made in writing, under oath, to the Assessor and the time for filing such declaration shall expire sixty days after written demand to file an income-tax return shall have been received by such officer or employee. As used in this subsection the term 'State' means the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and the term 'Government of the United States' includes any

agency or instrumentality thereof, but does not include the Government of the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,  
GEORGE J. BATES,  
JOS. P. O'HARA,  
JNO. L. McMILLAN,  
HOWARD W. SMITH,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HARRY P. CAIN,  
RALPH E. FLANDERS  
(Per H. C.),

J. HOWARD MCGRATH  
(Per H. C.),

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill defined the word "resident", for the purpose of the income tax, to mean every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The House bill also provided that the word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or employees of the United States Government, nor shall it include any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States. The House bill also provided that for the purposes of the act the domicile of such officer or employee shall be in the State in which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile, with the proviso that he shall have acquired a domicile in such State under the laws of such State prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed. The declaration must be made in writing, under oath, to the assessor, and the time for filing such declaration shall not expire until 60 days after written demand shall have been received by such officer or employee.

The Senate amendment provides that the word "resident" means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The Senate amendment further provides that the word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States, unless such officers are domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year. Under the Senate amendment a Federal employee is not exempt from the District income tax if such employee maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year whether or not he is domiciled within the District.

The House has instructed its managers to insist on the provisions of the House bill containing the so-called O'Hara amendment.

The House managers were therefore bound to bring back the substance of that amendment. However, it was agreed at the conference that some clarification of the language of the House provision was desirable. Therefore, the House recedes with an amendment which makes clear that in the case of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency or instrumentality thereof but not including the government of the District of Columbia), who is domiciled outside the District during the whole of the taxable year, there shall be excluded from his gross income (1) salaries or wages received from the Government for services rendered as such officer or employee and (2) income derived from sources without the District. In other words, it will carry out the intent of the House that income derived by such officers or employees from within the District, for example, income from operating a taxicab, an apartment house, or business or professional activity, shall be taxable if their place of abode has been within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year. It is also made clear that the declaration of any such officer or employee that his domicile for any taxable year is in a State shall be conclusive, but only if he had a domicile in that State under the laws of that State immediately prior to the beginning of the taxable year for which the tax is claimed; and of course the latter issue may be litigated.

Amendment No. 2: The House bill provided that the words "gross income" shall not include all amounts up to and including \$2,000 paid during the taxable year to veterans under any law of the United States, or under any law of any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof as benefits or pensions for disability arising out of injuries received during any period of war.

The Senate amendment provides that the words "gross income" shall not include payments of benefits made to or on account of a beneficiary under any of the laws relating to veterans. The Senate amendment restates existing law. The House recedes.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,  
GEORGE J. BATES,  
JOS. P. O'HARA,  
JNO. L. McMILLAN,  
HOWARD W. SMITH,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is no controversy about the report. The Members will appreciate that we had this conference report on the floor a week or 10 days ago. At that time the conferees were mandated to take the bill back to conference with instructions to restore the language that has popularly become known as the O'Hara amendment. With only suitable and clarifying amendments that mandate has been observed, so we now include that language in the conference report under the mandate of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the amendment, known as the O'Hara amendment, which was adopted in the House, has been preserved in the conference report with some two or three additional clarifications which do not change the spirit of the amendment. I make this statement merely so that there will be no concern on the part of Members of the House who supported the amendment as to the principle involved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

#### PAROLE SYSTEM IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 494) to reorganize the system of parole of prisoners convicted in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after "compensation" insert "one of whom shall be elected Chairman of the said Board."

Page 4, line 11, strike out all after "may" down to and including "promulgate," in line 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CONTROLLING DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. O'HARA, ALLEN of California, and ABERNETHY.

#### FASCISM IN ACTION

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the manuscript of a documented study and analyses of Fascism in Action, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago the Library of Congress, at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], prepared a very fine booklet on Communism in Action. More than 400,000 or 500,000 copies of this excellent booklet have been distributed. I think it is not only a worth-while document and a constructive document, but I think it is essential for the people of our country to have the knowledge and information contained in that booklet. That booklet was prepared under the direction of Dr. Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service. It was prepared under the provisions of the new reorganization of Congress act which gave the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress the privilege of preparing the booklet upon the request of any Member of the House or Senate. When this booklet was printed I wrote to Dr. Griffith and told him that he had done a wonderful job on it and asked him if he would undertake a similar study on fascism. Although I am opposed to communism in any shape, form, or fashion, I am also opposed to fascism in any shape, form, or fashion, and while it is necessary and highly desirable that the people of our country know the evils of communism it is likewise essential that they know about the evils of fascism. Dr. Griffith advised me that in compliance with the law he had the right to prepare such a book and that if I requested it he would be very glad to undertake it. So I made my request in writing, a copy of which I will insert in my statement today.

Dr. Griffith undertook the study. We set a dead line of February 3. The only reason we had a deadline was because we wanted to work to a certain date because when the book was finished I expected to offer a resolution such as has been presented here today for the printing of it as a House document in the same way that the booklet Communism in Action was printed.

This book on fascism has been prepared under the direction of the same man, Dr. Ernest Griffith. It has been prepared by the same staff, so it cannot be said that people who were partisans or biased in the case of communism or fascism prepared this report. They were both prepared by the same people.

The Committee on House Administration held hearings for 3 days. The chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing, have been very patient with those of us who have been sponsoring this resolution. I want to personally thank them today for the consideration they have given, and also the members of that committee. I, too, want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] for his extreme fairness demonstrated today by permitting me, as the author of the resolution, not only to open the discussion but to close it. I think that shows extreme fairness, and I appreciate it very much.

This booklet on fascism in action, which was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, has not been made public. Only 26 copies have been mimeographed. This is one for my own personal use, and there was a copy furnished to each of the 25 members of the Committee on House Administration. It has been gone over by the members of that committee. It has been criticized, and suggestions have been made as to changes. Dr. Griffith and other members of his staff have appeared before the committee and answered questions. I was there 3 days attempting to answer every question I could answer, that was asked by members of that committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Personally, I cannot see why there should be any objection to it. We want to know about communism. We dislike communism. We hate socialism, too, as well as communism. That is an enemy that is approaching us from the left. We must watch that enemy and be on the alert against that enemy. At the same time there is an equally vicious enemy, that is equally devastating and destructive, approaching us from the right, in the form of fascism. Let us give to our people and inform ourselves the same with reference to one deadly enemy as to another. We do not want either. So any information or knowledge that can be disseminated that would be helpful to the American people in detecting and preventing either one of these destructive isms, is in the public interest to have that information disseminated.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Will the gentleman tell us how many copies he expects to have made of this document and how much it will cost?

Mr. PATMAN. I expect to ask for a hundred thousand at first. If there is a demand for more we will ask for more. It may not be as popular as the book on communism. There were 500,000 of that booklet printed. But the cost is not the important thing. We have just gone through a war against fascism, which cost us three or four hundred billion dollars, so it would not be too much expense to pay a few dollars more to inform the public.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. We are still in the stage that we would like to know how much these things are going to cost.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is a member of the committee and we had evidence.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. But would you mind telling the House?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is a member of the committee and he can tell the House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The matter of copies is not involved in this resolution. This simply makes it a House document, and there will perhaps be 1,500 copies printed. Then, when people want them they can get them at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. PATMAN. And pay the Public Printer for them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. If this manuscript is made a House document, what will it cost to print 1,500 copies?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know what the cost would be. I do not know but what it would be about the same amount as Communism in Action, probably a little more because one chapter was left out of Communism in Action which was printed as a Senate document; but the two put together would be just about the size of Fascism in Action.

Mr. FULTON. What did Communism in Action cost?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know. The cost is not really the important part about it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The cost under this resolution for the printing of Fascism in Action as a House document is \$1,625. I believe that is the Government estimate.

Mr. FULTON. There are copies available for anyone to see in the Library, are there not?

Mr. LECOMPTE. There are only a very few copies available at the present time.

Mr. FULTON. But there are some available.

Mr. PATMAN. There are none available.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I do not know whether the Library has any available or not.

Mr. PATMAN. There is not one copy available.

Mr. FULTON. How many copies have been available so far?

I am inserting herewith the letter I wrote to Dr. Griffith concerning the preparation of this booklet.

It is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., September 24, 1946.  
DR. ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,  
Legislative Reference Service, Library  
of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. GRIFFITH: I have received and read with interest the booklet which you prepared at the request of Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN on Communism in Action. It is House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. This booklet is very fine and I have enjoyed reading it. If it does nothing more than arouse a lot of people about the evils of communism, it will certainly be worth while. It is my belief that the book will serve a very fine useful purpose and you are to be commended for the contribution you have made in its compilation.

I am opposed to communism in any form. It should be fought with every means at our command. It is obnoxious to our American democratic system of free enterprise based upon initiative, intelligence, ability, and hard work. Our system is the best in the world and, although it is so much better than communism, I just can't believe that communism can get any hold in America, yet we must be on the alert and make sure that there is no formidable start toward communism.

At the same time I dislike fascism. I think fascism is just as bad as communism. They are both equally bad. I would not attempt to say which is worse. To my mind fascism has a stronger hold in our country today than communism because its roots have become so firmly planted by so much abler and stronger hands and minds. Fascism in our country today is backed by plenty of wealth and a day never passes that the people of our country are not flooded with literature which would lead them down the road to fascism.

Therefore, this letter, in addition to commending you on the book on Communism in Action, is to request you, as Director of the Legislative Reference Service, to prepare a book on fascism to show how fascism operates and to cover generally the same line of approach that you covered in the book on communism.

If you will prepare such a booklet, I expect to offer a resolution in Congress, January 3 next, asking that it be made a public document in order that it may receive wide distribution.

I hope the time will never come in this country when our people will fear only communism or only fascism. They should fear both. Since the book has been prepared on communism, I hope that people will not get the idea that fascism is not feared just as much by Congress and the Legislative Reference Service as communism.

Please advise me at your earliest convenience if you will undertake the preparation of the booklet on fascism in action.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I certainly have no love for fascism, nor do I have any love for communism. But a certain radio commentator and newspaperman, by the name of Drew Pearson, said the other day that I was willing to fight fascism overseas but apparently I did not care about fighting it here in the United States because I opposed the printing of this document in my committee. He was talking about something that he did not know a thing in the world about.

In the first place, the document Fascism in Action has been played up by the left-wing press, by George Seldes and his publication, *In Fact*, by PM, by the Communist Daily Worker, and by other left-wing publications as being an exposé of fascism in the United States. I challenge any man, including the authors of this document, to show me where any Fascist organization is even so much as mentioned in this book with the possible exception of the foreword by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. It is just not in here. As a matter of fact the title of the thing is "A Documented Study and Analysis of Fascism in Europe," and does not even mention a single Fascist organization in the United States.

If there were any such thing as a Fascist movement in the United States I might say let us print this book, but I asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] when he appeared before the committee, to show us some evidence that there was a Fascist movement in the United States and that this book would help expose it. The gentleman from

Texas could not show me—or refused to show me and the committee any evidence that there was any Fascist movement in the United States. The only thing we will be doing in printing this book, in my opinion, will be to draw a red herring across the trail of the Communists in America. In other words, I think we will confuse the issue on the Communists which do constitute a threat to our American form of government and really enter on a witch hunt after some fictitious Fascists who proponents of this measure would have you believe are abroad in our country. As a matter of fact I think that before we expend the people's money in printing this book we should be shown some reason for printing the book. I do not think that it is incumbent upon us to show any reason why it should not be printed until some reason has first been shown why it should be printed.

As I understand it this book will cost about twice as much to print as "Communism in Action." The first 1,400 copies of this book I understand will cost around \$1,600. The first 1,400 copies of Communism in Action cost in the vicinity of \$390.

There was a strong demand for Communism in Action because it has been shown that there is a definite Communist threat in the United States.

The only demand that has come for Fascism in Action has come from certain left-wing groups in this country, such as the previously mentioned radical publications. According to the information that I have, there were a great many letters written protesting the printing of Communism in Action, but to date I am advised by the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee that not a single letter has been received from any Fascist or Fascist organization in the United States protesting the printing of this book. So this Fascist threat to our form of government is all in the imagination and is beyond my scope of comprehension. Certainly if there were Fascist organizations in this country plotting the overthrow of our Government, they would have cried to high heaven.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman may not be aware of it but the Communist Daily Worker, PM, and *In Fact*, the George Seldes Communist publication call southern Democrats and northern Republicans Fascists.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman. I may say further that I have found certain passages in this book that would tend, by inference and comparison, to brand northern Republicans and southern Democrats as Fascists, if you want to use this book as an authority. I think that it is a cleverly worded, indirect indictment of certain parts of our country—particularly the South.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the question here is whether you are for communism or fascism. The question is whether or not the expense shall be paid by this Government to print another Government document.

When you get a Government document that has been prepared by the Legislative Reference Service you have a document that has been prepared by impartial people. That is not the question either. The question is whether you wish to start the practice of having everything that is made up by these people printed and that the taxpayers shall pay for it. At first I asked what the cost was and the sponsor of the resolution did not know the cost. I then asked the committee how much the cost would be and I was informed it would be \$1,680 for the first thousand copies. Then the sponsor of the resolution said he wants 100,000 printed. That is too much for me.

If you get into the printing of these documents by the hundreds of thousands because the Legislative Reference Service is working on them all the time, it will become a never-ending proposition. They are also working for the Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as many other committees. If you start printing such items there is no end to it.

If there are documents that there is a great public demand for, about which you can say your demand will be so-and-so and can prove it, I am in favor of printing them and printing them at the people's expense. However, I am not in favor of turning out a 5-foot shelf of books for every committee that wants these things printed. If we start doing this for one person we are going to have to do it for everybody.

May I ask the sponsor of the resolution how many specific people have asked for copies and how many copies they have asked for?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know. I think probably the chairman of the committee could answer that because the requests would be made to him.

Mr. FULTON. Let me ask the chairman of the committee: How many people have asked for this and how many copies do they want?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me finish the answer. I have received, I believe, a few hundred requests from people who heard about it.

Mr. FULTON. Are they willing to pay \$1 and something for each copy?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; some of them are. The gentleman I think is a little bit misleading. He does not intend to be. The fact is your expense is in connection with the first thousand. After that there is not much expense to it. The Government Printing Office will print them and get its money back.

Mr. FULTON. If there is not enough to pay for the first thousand in requests, the Government is already at a deficit when it prints the first thousand, and I have not heard anything more from the sponsor of the resolution himself except the request for a couple of hundred. So on his own statement there is a deficit of \$800.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I have had a great many requests for this pamphlet.

Mr. FULTON. For how many?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not know.

Mr. FULTON. Would the gentleman say 100 or 200?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I would say something like that. It is something that there has been a certain amount of publicity carried on in the newspapers and there have been letters coming in from universities, college women's clubs around the country, and so forth, hoping it will be printed.

Mr. FULTON. That would still leave a deficit of \$600 on the first thousand, even taking the gentleman's own statement.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there is definitely an interest in the mail. It is one of the subjects about which people seem to be interested.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the able gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman of course knows, as I am sure he does, that these books will not cost \$1 a copy. It will probably cost as much to print the first one, after all the type has been set up, as it will several thousand. The \$1 cost of the first thousand does not mean that the next thousand will cost that much, or the next 10,000 will cost as much as the first thousand. I doubt it.

Mr. FULTON. No, but I believe the gentleman from Texas will agree with me that it will be a substantial cost.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is true of any of these documents, of course.

Mr. FULTON. If it will cost that amount of \$1,680 to print the first thousand, the successive printings will be a substantial amount also, although not in the same amount.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. As to the matter of mail, I come from Brooklyn where we have quite a number of colleges and schools and a library system, and I have received requests of the librarians of a dozen different libraries and from hundreds of students in the colleges and schools in Brooklyn asking for copies.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the gentleman from New York, whom I respect very much, how many requests he has received?

Mr. CELLER. I would say I received about 75 requests.

Mr. FULTON. Then, add the gentleman's 75 to the gentleman from California's 200 and the sponsor's request for 200, you have 475, so there is still a deficit there on the first thousand.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, my good friend on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that you cannot possibly decide this thing on any

such narrow basis as the \$1,600 cost, or whether there is a demand for 750 or 1,000 copies? What you are really doing is this: There has been much consideration given to Communism in Action, and it is justified. Every American should know about Communism in Action. But is it not true that our greatest American tradition is even-handedness, and as it is conscientiously believed that there is a situation requiring the publication of Fascism in Action, that history ought to be told, too. It ought to be made available on an even basis and in the same way. The \$1,600 expense really cannot be considered to be important compared with the matter of treating on an even-handed basis with both of the totalitarian extremes of communism and fascism.

Mr. FULTON. Let me say to the gentleman that certainly American democracy has had 6 or 7 years of intensive practice and indoctrination on the evils of fascism. The gentleman and I were participants in the last war to stop fascism. I thought that when we had finished this war we were through with fascism. Now, my point is, I do not want to go into ancient history and further expense to publish ancient history books here. I understood from one of the gentlemen who spoke here previously that this was simply a documentation of fascism in Europe, that is, Italy and Germany, and that it had almost nothing to do with America.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is not the same thing true of Communism in Action, that it dealt with Russia and Europe?

Mr. FULTON. That is where we disagree. I think there is little fascism in the United States.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am strictly in a neutral corner on this matter. I want to find out about the merits of the book. We are talking about costs and we are talking about various other things, and I know there are some of us on the floor here that would like to know a little about the merits of the book. Is the principal object to give publicity to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] or is this a book that has sufficient merit to be put into published form along with the other book on communism, and are they both about situations in the United States, or is one about communism in the United States and the other about fascism in Europe? As one Member on this floor, I would like to have the answers to the questions concerning the actual requirements and necessities and the merits of the book and not entirely about whether it is going to cost \$1,600 or \$800.

Mr. FULTON. There have been inferences made at times, but I do not think the gentleman from Texas has put the book out for that purpose.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on House Administration and have heard the arguments made both pro and con regarding this matter. It seems to me that since Communism in Action has been published, if we should fail to publish Fascism in Action, it could very well be effectively urged by some people who would not care to do our country any good that we were winking at one extreme.

Personally I am very much opposed to communism and I am also very much opposed to fascism. I am opposed to anything that is subversive of good Americanism. I believe you will agree with me that both communism and fascism are opposed to Americanism. I believe you will also agree with me that we must be always alert in this country and anxious and active in supporting our American way of life.

I do not believe in going on witch hunts and I definitely do not believe in becoming hysterical. Personally, I do not agree with a great many very fine people in this House in their views about imminent danger. I do not see it as some do. Honestly I cannot. But I do recognize the fact that there is always some danger that we might actually lose our way of life. We can lose it by the Fascist route just as well as we can by the Communist route. Sometimes I am constrained to think that we could lose it more easily that way.

I think we would do an unwise thing if we should publish Communism in Action, which we have done, and then refuse to publish Fascism in Action. I believe it could be effectively said by a great many people that we were winking at one and fighting only the other.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to my distinguished friend from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman agree with me that there is more need for the application of the principles of the Holy Bible today than there would be for Fascism in Action?

Mr. MORRIS. Of course we always need the Bible. All of us need it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am wondering if the gentleman would also support the printing of the Holy Bible as a House document? What does the gentleman think about that?

Mr. MORRIS. I think that might be going just a little bit far. I think I should oppose that. I believe I should be compelled to do that.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman knows that we had other enemies than just Germany and Italy. He knows that we were fighting Japan. Some of us who were in the Pacific feel that if you publish Fascism in Action you then should publish Shintoism in Action, because we were also fighting that aggressive "ism." If you leave Shintoism out and publish Communism in Action and Fascism in Action, you then must go on to Shintoism, because otherwise you would be agreeing with Shintoism. Then when

you get a little further, unless you take what the gentleman from Mississippi says as to the Bible, and publish the Bible, you are in favor of Buddhism and Mohammedanism.

Mr. MORRIS. It is rather trite to put it that way, but I believe that is hardly logical and accurate. If a person has a headache, it is a very good idea sometimes, I think, not to get in the habit of it, but to take an aspirin, but I believe it would be a very bad thing for a man to take a whole box of aspirins at one time. It may be a very good idea for us to publish some of these things occasionally, but if we start to publish everything on any and every subject or ideology that we might disagree with, of course, it would be carrying the matter to an absurd point.

Sometimes I doubt that Congress should have ever gotten into this publishing business. Perhaps that is not the best way to do this. But since we have started it, certainly it would be unwise in my judgment if we did not publish both booklets.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to the remarks made by distinguished colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS]. Like him, I dislike communism and fascism both. We discussed this at some length in the committee, and it was finally concluded that while we did not like either fascism or communism, inasmuch as we had printed the book *Communism in Action* it was only fair and proper that we should also print something about fascism if some Member wanted it printed.

Some people do not like whisky and some people do not like gambling. It is all sinful. Of course, we are all against sin. So if we are going to waste time talking about the evils of gambling, we might as well waste time talking about the evils of drinking. That is just about what this discussion of fascism and communism amounts to.

It has been charged here that this book would give aid and comfort to the Communists if it were put out. That might be. But we all know that people who believe in a totalitarian form of government will use anything they can for aid and comfort. They frequently quote the Bible in order to get aid and comfort for themselves. They are bound, of course, to quote this booklet if it is printed. But, nevertheless, if it is fair for one side to print its case, it is fair for the other to have its printed. I think, just as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] stated, that we would be making a grievous error to print one side of the picture and then not agree to print the other side.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, I sat on the committee when we voted to print 500,000 copies of *Communism in Action*. Fascism is a totalitarian form of government, and the reason I voted for this book, which I hope will be published, is that it will enable us to ap-

preciate more what our own country stands for. I am not afraid of communism or fascism when we have leadership which will put into vital action the great ideals that we stand for. From reading the book which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had compiled, I think that what we learn is to have a greater appreciation and love of the fundamental truths of mankind which our country stands for.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I just thumbed through the study called *Fascism in Action* which is a documented study and analysis of fascism in Europe. If you read this I take it that you will have danger signals planted in this country so that we can avoid the pitfalls and dangers that befell the people of Italy, Germany, the Argentine, and Spain, so that we can profit from their experiences. Does not the gentleman think that is the case?

Mr. SMATHERS. Absolutely, and I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can appreciate the remarks made by our distinguished minority leader regarding the effect of this book and that possibly we would have more love for our country if we had a better understanding of the way fascism worked in Europe. But I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that we do have a greater love for our American form of government just because of the blood that was shed over there during the last 7 years and that we do not need this book to make us love America as compared to fascism.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the gentleman very much for his observation, but I do not agree with him at all. It is not a case of whether or not we love America. Let us assume that we all do and that we love democracy. The point is that we are trying to show up the evils to this government. We as a group may fall into the evils of communism on the one hand or fascism on the other hand if we are not made aware of the evils of both.

This book, as I understand it, was not designed to indict any particular group in the United States. I understand that the book *Communism in Action* did not point out any particular groups but merely showed how communism worked and how a country could easily fall into a Fascist dictatorship or a Communist dictatorship without realizing it. It was also brought out at the committee hearings that as far as this book is concerned, you could take the word "Fascism" and substitute it for the word "Communism," because those ideologies are so similar that you can work from one to the other without hardly knowing it. That should be brought out so that the people would know that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been amazed today as I have witnessed the opposition mount on the floor of the House, to printing as a House document the Legislative Reference analysis of *Fascism in Action*.

The two main points of criticism have been as follows:

(a) The cost of \$1,600 is an unnecessary expenditure for printing the first 1,000 copies.

(b) There is no need for such a study as there are no Fascist groups or Fascist philosophy in the United States.

Regarding the cost objection I have only this to say: It is a hypocritically falacious excuse. We have engaged in the greatest war in the world's history against fascism and its twin nazism. We spent over \$300,000,000 and incurred a million casualties to defeat these twin totalitarian philosophies. To hesitate now to spend \$1,600 for an impartial analysis of the methods and procedures used by the Fascist dictators to enslave their people is parsimony beyond measure.

Can it be that those who oppose the printing of this exposure of Fascist methods are fearful that the yardstick may be used to measure some of our own native Fascist organizations and fascistically inclined people?

I voted for the analysis made by the Legislative Reference which was labeled *Communism in Action*. I have distributed hundreds of these booklets in my district. I would like to follow the same procedure with the *Fascism in Action* analysis.

I am one of those people who fervently believe that in our constitutional democracy there are methods and procedures which can obtain by peaceable means the reforms and improvements we need. I do not believe that we have to turn to any totalitarian method of government for advice or aid.

I fervently believe that our people should know from an authoritative source the fallacies contained in totalitarian beliefs, methods, and procedures. I believe so sincerely in the principles of true democracy that I am willing to place them in competition with any other form of government known to man. I have no doubts as to the outcome of such competition and comparison.

Now as to the second objection raised, that there is no Fascist philosophy groups or individuals in the United States, I brand this contention as false and shocking in the ignorance it betrays.

One has only to recite a few of the groups that have been active in the last decade, many of whom avowedly followed the Nazi-Fascist line to realize the danger of this objection. I give here the names of only a few, the German-American Bund, the Ku Klux Klan, the Black Legion, the Silver Shirts, the Society of

Sentinels, and many others can be gleaned from the La Follette Committee's report on the investigation of civil liberties.

The recent seditionist trial revealed the names of many professional, racist, labor hating, Fascist leaders, such as Gerald L. K. Smith, Lawrence Dennis, George Sylvester Viereck, Joseph P. Kamp, Elizabeth Dilling, and scores of others who have been indicted for pro-Fascist leadership. To say then that there is no cause to expose such Fascist groups and leaders as cited above, or to state that no such Fascist danger exists is to either expose a dangerous ignorance or to become a willing or unwilling tool of sinister forces.

These forces are not dead, either in Europe or America. They are dangerous to the liberty of free men in our democracy.

No expense or trouble is too great, to expose to the pitiless glare of publicity the methods, procedures, aims, and purposes of totalitarian philosophies, regardless of whether they be Fascist, Nazi, Shinto, or Communist. I have faith in the superiority of democracy. I believe it can function to solve the problem of economic security, while maintaining the dignity and liberty of the individual.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised at the debate on this resolution. It seems to me it is a very simple question to decide. I cannot understand why the debate should hinge on the small amount of money involved. I recall several resolutions that were voted out of our committee, which came before this House, many of them carrying provisions which would necessitate very large appropriations, and they were brought up and passed by unanimous consent.

This resolution, it seems to me, should require very little debate if we want to be fair. We voted for Communism in Action, and we were very glad to do so. I think probably that manuscript has done a great deal of good in this country. Perhaps it has taught many people, who knew very little about communism, the dangers of it. I think if this resolution is adopted and we have the manuscript printed, it will have the same effect.

I heard one of the speakers say that this had to do with fascism in Europe. I think the manuscript on Communism in Action had to do with Russia. Is that not right?

Mr. PATMAN. I think that is correct. It is a technical analysis of communism in action in the Soviet Union.

Mrs. NORTON. That is correct; and this is fascism in Europe, where there is and has been much fascism with tragic results. Probably we have quite a bit of fascism in this country also. I think we ought to be warned of its dangers. We must realize that both communism and fascism are very great dangers to our democracy. Because of that I think we ought to know wherein the danger lies.

I would also like to see a companion piece to both of these manuscripts prepared on "Democracy in Action." Of

course, we should know all about democracy. But do we? We are living under a democracy, but I am very much afraid there are many people in this country who do not seem to know very much about what democracy means. We have plenty of fascism in this country. Certainly we have plenty of antidemocracy. So perhaps we should have another manuscript prepared on "Democracy in Action." I believe that if "Democracy in Action" were to become a textbook, let us say, in all of the schools of this country, we would have neither fascism nor communism. People would know exactly how lucky we are and how very fortunate this country is. A fact many seem to forget.

So let us not talk about a few thousand dollars in connection with this resolution. We have voted so many thousands of dollars for so many things that have been so much less important that we should not quibble about a thousand dollars more or less. The manuscript is carefully prepared under the direction of Dr. Ernest Griffith and his staff. The same director and practically the same staff as the one that prepared "Communism in Action." I believe both communism and fascism are threats against the future peace of the world. Any good information about either is necessary and should be available notwithstanding the small cost to the Government. I do not believe that the small cost involved is the reason anybody really is objecting to this resolution; I think it probably goes much deeper and I sincerely hope that the Members will feel as I do, that we should have all the knowledge possible on communism and on fascism and on democracy, too. An informed public can be depended on to make a comparison and then we need have no fear as to the verdict.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if the Clerk would read the report of the Committee on House Administration.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 104]

|                |              |                |
|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Andrews, N. Y. | Cox          | Harness, Ind.  |
| Bell           | Cravens      | Hartley        |
| Bennett, Mich. | Crawford     | Hébert         |
| Bland          | Davis, Tenn. | Heffernan      |
| Bloom          | Dawson, Ill. | Hendricks      |
| Boggs, La.     | Dawson, Utah | Hinsaw         |
| Bolton         | Delaney      | Jenkins, Ohio  |
| Buckley        | Domenegeaux  | Jennings       |
| Bulwinkle      | Dorn         | Johnson, Okla. |
| Byrne, N. Y.   | Eaton        | Jones, N. C.   |
| Camp           | Elliot       | Jones, Wash.   |
| Case, S. Dak.  | Flannagan    | Kearns         |
| Chadwick       | Gallagher    | Keating        |
| Cole, Mo.      | Gifford      | Kee            |
| Cole, N. Y.    | Granger      | Kelley         |
| Coudert        | Hagen        | Kennedy        |

|                 |            |              |
|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| Kerr            | Nixon      | Short        |
| Kilburn         | Norrell    | Simpson, Pa. |
| King            | O'Toole    | Smith, Ohio  |
| Lea             | Pfeiffer   | Thomas, Tex. |
| Love            | Powell     | Vail         |
| Lynch           | Priest     | Vinson       |
| Mansfield, Tex. | Rayfiel    | Vursell      |
| Mason           | Redden     | Wadsworth    |
| Meade, Ky.      | Rich       | Welch        |
| Michener        | St. George | West         |
| Mills           | Sanborn    |              |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 350 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### REVENUE BILL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 58.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed, in section 2 of article III, to insert after the word "repealed" the following: ", effective on the first day of the first month following the approval of this act."*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION LEGISLATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time to take up for consideration the bill, S. 564, the Presidential succession bill; that general debate continue not to exceed 2 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and one-half by the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if this bill becomes law and if unfortunately anything should happen to the President, the bill provides that the Speaker of the House would succeed?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. SABATH. If unfortunately it had to be a Republican, I do not know of any man I would rather see President than the present Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### FASCISM IN ACTION

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have under consideration House Resolution 83, which reads as follows:

*Resolved, That the manuscript of a documented study and analyses of Fascism in Action, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.*

This resolution was voted out of the subcommittee of the House Administration Committee without recommendation. It was also voted out of the House Administration Committee without recommendation. It is therefore up to the House itself to decide what action is to be taken on the resolution.

No person who has been through the sacrifices of the last world war can offer any objections to a constructive pamphlet on fascism. The first chapters of the draft presented in the proposed document constitute a very able analysis of fascism in Germany and Italy. One can offer no valid objection to these sections.

Mr. Speaker, there has been so much misrepresentation about this document entitled "Fascism in Action" that I think a review of its history would be in order. I must admit that I did not know such a document existed, or was even in the subcommittee, until one Sunday night I turned on the radio and heard Mr. Drew Pearson accuse the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing, of bottling up the document *Fascism in Action*. From the remarks of Mr. Pearson on the radio I thought it might be interesting to look into the document *Fascism in Action*. I therefore cannot claim a great deal of credit for my analysis of the document because I probably would never have given it a second thought if Mr. Pearson had not called it to my attention.

Unfortunately, the document was not available in its final form then, but was available about a week later. I read it very carefully and found there were inaccuracies in it. At the hearing of the full Committee on House Administration, Dr. Griffith and Dr. Kalijarvi agreed to correct these inaccuracies. I pointed out several other portions that should be revised, and they agreed to make those revisions.

It is unfortunate that printed hearings are not available to the Members of Congress so that they might study them and know exactly what has been under consideration by the committee. However, the hearings have not been returned from the Government Printing Office so we do not have them available in order to make a real evaluation in this debate. It is also unfortunate, the final revised copy of the document is not available to all Members of Congress so they could read its contents in final form.

Someone mentioned there is a demand for this document. I want to explain what created this so-called demand. In the March 17, 1947, issue of *In Fact*, published by George Seldes, there appeared an article entitled "GOP Blocks New United States Book on Fascism." In this article Mr. Seldes makes a great many unfounded charges against the committee and the majority party, together with an appeal to his subscribers to write the chairman of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing for copies of the document. That is what created the so-called demand.

I checked every post card and letter the committee received. I think it was

the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], who asked for this information. I wish to advise him that there were 669 post cards and letters sent in to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], chairman of the committee, and 152 to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing. Eighty percent of those sent to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] were duplicates. I analyzed the dates on those post cards and letters and practically every one of them was sent in within a period of 3 weeks after the article appeared in *In Fact*.

I regret the hearings are not available because all this information is brought out in them.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Is it not a fact that the same staff prepared this manuscript that prepared the Communist manuscript?

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentlewoman from New Jersey is in error because many people worked on this document who did not work on Communism in Action; but it was prepared by the staff of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Mrs. NORTON. Dr. Griffith was the chairman of that staff or, rather, the director of the staff; is that correct?

Mr. BUSBEY. That is true.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If we were to print this, why should we not have a study by the Library of Congress, the FBI, and the House Un-American Activities Committee made on communism right here in America?

Mr. BUSBEY. Some of the previous speakers brought up the question of getting acquainted with fascism in America, its dangers, and why we should become acquainted with that subject. I agree with the statement. We should be advised of any Fascists or Fascist organizations in America. But there is not one single word in the document *Fascism in Action* regarding any Fascist organization or any Fascist individual in America.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is it all about then?

Mr. BUSBEY. It is a study and analysis of fascism in Europe. I wish to advise the Members that 60 percent of the document is on nazism in Germany and the pamphlet, to be correct, should be called *Nazism in Action* because the part devoted to fascism is much smaller than that devoted to nazism in Germany.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the gentleman will indulge me just a moment, I want to say that I think this is a venture in education, and while I know nothing about the contents of the document, I am going to vote for it. Now, Communism in Action has had a subscription of

about 700,000 copies, and I think it is very useful. I want to concur in the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan that there is a growing need for a companion piece called *Communism in America* that should be documented and it should be printed by the millions of copies so that every citizen and every American will know what this ism really is within the boundaries of our own country.

Mr. BUSBEY. I agree with the gentleman that the people of the United States should be warned about the menace of communism in the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. Not at the present time, please. I think the gentleman from Illinois has time of his own, if I am not mistaken.

The House Administration Committee, on my motion, agreed to write to Secretary of State General Marshall, and request him to make available for this document the agreement between Ribbentrop and Litvinov, or the famous German-Russian Treaty before Hitler attacked Russia, because it would be a valuable addition to this document. Unfortunately, we have not received a reply from Secretary of State Marshall, and I hope the information will be available before the document is printed.

Mr. Speaker, the *Daily Worker* of June 18, 1947, says:

Congressional attempts being made to suppress or censor part of its report, *Fascism in Action*, are caused by big business stooges in and out of the House.

I defy anybody to name any big business stooges or any businessmen that have been trying to keep this document from being published. I have to admit that I was the member of the committee that raised the objection to the inaccuracies and suggested the changes that should be made in the document. I will take oath that no one in or out of business has approached me at any time to try to keep me from having this document printed.

It is generally agreed among the members of the House Administration Committee that the document, *Fascism in Action*, is a better one in its revised form. However, I do think it can still be improved. Please understand, I am not opposed to the printing of a document on fascism, whether it deals with Europe or America, but I am sure every Member of this body must agree with me in wanting any document on this subject printed as a public document by the House of Representatives to be as actual and factual as possible.

I yield to no one in my firm belief that all doctrines that are un-American and inimical to our form of government should be exposed in order that the people of our country might easily recognize them and thereby be in a position to stamp them out. Certainly fascism comes within this field as well as nazism and communism. Any document or book which presents any proof of any Fascist organizations or individuals in the United States should be made available to the people in order that they may know who our enemies are, especially here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us are firmly indoctrinated in the principles outlined in the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights. That living document protects the individual from the excesses of the state, and it might well be the hallmark of any political movement really trying to bring democracy to a chaotic world. It is natural that we abhor any system purporting to bring democracy to this world which in reality is a system to glorify the state at the expense of the individual, especially during a period when such state power culminates in a single dictator. Regardless of the label, the test is a simple one. Any state subordinating the rights of the individual to the whims and caprices of a dictator cannot be a democratic state according to our conception. Regardless of our political divergencies, we all have been trained since childhood to a recognition of certain legal and ethical concepts.

Instinctively I recoil from any political system which has as a fundamental tenet the antithesis of what we regard as these legal and ethical concepts. I know it is as repugnant to you as it is to me. Let me refresh your recollection by the following illuminating quotations from authoritative Communist and Nazi sources.

The Thesis and Statutes of the Communist International, adopted in 1920, and a fundamental document for all Communist parties, states that—

The task of the proletariat consists of blowing up the whole machinery of the bourgeoisie—in destroying it, and all the parliamentary institutions with it. . . .

Every Communist member (of Parliament) must remember that he is not a legislator who is bound to seek agreements with the other legislators, but an agitator of the party detailed into the enemy's camp in order to carry out the orders of the party there.

On April 30, 1928, Dr. Goebbels, the Nazi propagandist, wrote in his paper *Der Angriff*:

We enter Parliament in order to supply ourselves, in the arsenal of democracy, with its own weapons. We become members of the Reichstag in order to paralyze the Weimar sentiment with its own assistance. If democracy is so stupid as to give us free tickets and salaries for this bear's work, that is its affair.

I note with deep regret that the document prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress does not mention a single Fascist organization or individual in the United States; in fact, it ignores the subject entirely.

The original document did not bring to the attention of the reader the striking similarity between fascism, communism, and nazism. I, therefore, suggested the inclusion in the preface of my 16 points of similarity of these systems of dictatorship. These will appear in the revised document.

Unfortunately, the foreword by the sponsor, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], deals with a subject far removed from the contents of the document. He makes many charges and accusations that he not only does not back up with proof of fact but was unwilling to do so when he was a witness before the House Administration Com-

mittee. He makes no analysis of concrete manifestations of Fascist attitudes, such as Gerald L. K. Smith, the Columbians, and the Ku Klux Klan.

Dr. Louis Domeratzky, one of the leading economists of our country, was employed at considerable expense in the middle of October 1946 to act as editor-in-chief of the document. His biography, from *Who's Who in America*, reveals his special qualifications for the task.

Four of the chapters were written by Dr. Domeratzky and submitted to Dr. Griffith in their finished form by February 1, 1947. These chapters were Finance and Fiscal Policy, Foreign Policy, Foreign Trade, and Organization of the Economy.

Sometime during the latter part of April changes were made in the four chapters written by Dr. Domeratzky by the Legislative Reference Service. Due to an almost overnight deadline demand of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], it was impossible to even discuss the rewritten chapters with Dr. Domeratzky.

It is my personal opinion that the four chapters prepared by Dr. Domeratzky are far superior to those prepared by the Legislative Reference Service and the document would be of far greater value if the chapters had not been rewritten.

In fairness to Dr. Griffith I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress what, in my judgment, is a serious defect in the Reorganization Act of 1946. At present, if any Member of Congress requests Dr. Griffith to prepare a document such as *Fascism in Action*, or any other book, he has no choice but to comply with the request. There are hundreds of subjects that Members of Congress might ask the Legislative Reference to prepare which they would like to sponsor. I ask you, in all fairness, is it right to use the time of these highly paid specialists to write books because one individual requests it, when their time should be used in preparing data for the various committees and for Members desiring data on important legislation pending before the Congress?

Throughout the manuscript, there was a tendency to generalize and to slant the writing in such a way as to provide the basis, after its appearance as a public document, for using the authority and judgment of the United States Government itself to prove that some present United States policies are similar to the Fascist and expansionist policies of Nazi Germany.

While the document, *Communism in Action*, will never serve the interests of the Soviet Union, the original proposed document, *Fascism in Action*, might have been a valuable propaganda vehicle for the Soviet Union and Communists all over the world.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I take a moment of this time to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] upon his interest in this document to the end that any inaccuracies that might be found would be discovered and corrected, and that seems to have been done.

I concur largely in and am moved in a large measure by the observation made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the effect that although I am not particularly familiar with the entire document I think it is one that deserves favorable action by the House in printing it as a public document.

I do not know who can define the word "fascism." There is such a thing as Nazi-fascism, which has been prevalent particularly in Germany, and it is not at all dead. It is alive and working today, and has been since very shortly after the cessation of hostilities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I am sorry, I have only 3 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Can the gentleman prove that statement?

Mr. FOLGER. Commissions of very estimable men have investigated the activities of nazism, a form of fascism, in Germany since the war was over, and find that it is growing day by day, week by week, month by month, and now year by year.

As I understand communism, it is another form of totalitarianism. Neither fascism nor communism regards the individual. In this democracy of ours we believe that God created man in His own image, that He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and that man became a living soul. There is, therefore, attached to every man that lives a dignity that is unsurpassed by position or power. A man is a man in a democracy. That is the form of government in which we believe. You and I as Members of this House today regard ourselves as the servants of the people of this country, and that is democracy, as opposed to totalitarianism, whether it be fascism or communism, in the world.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there are two extremes of ideology in the world. One is fascism and nazism, and the other is communism. We abhor both. We published *Communism in Action* as a House document, and we must, to be just and even-handed, publish *Fascism in Action*. I am for this resolution and shall vote for it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have already stated my views in opposition to the printing of this document. I want to use the time I now have for the purpose of telling the House that a motion to recommit this resolution will be made. I want to state the reasons.

In the first place, copies of this document have not been made available to every Member of the House, but have only been made available to members of the Committee on House Administration. Aside from the members of the Committee on House Administration, I dare say there is not a Member of the House who will know what he is voting for when he votes on this.

In the second place, the thing is still being revised, as I understand, and I do

not believe the House would be in a position to vote on it until it had seen the revised and final edition.

There are no hearings available for the use of the House now. They are in process of being printed, and I certainly think they should be available to the Members before they could vote intelligently on this document.

This came out of the subcommittee without recommendation to the full committee. It came from the full committee to the House without any recommendation. I think the House is entitled to have a little further knowledge of the contents and nature of this document before it votes on it. For that reason, a motion to recommit will be made, and I urgently ask the Members to vote to recommit this resolution to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand the expense of this is \$1,680 for the first thousand that would be printed. If you start printing a series of this sort of booklet, first comes Fascism in Action, and then you will have Democracy in Action, and then you are going to have Free Enterprise in Action, and you will go from there on. So the question is, Are you going to start a series of such "action" booklets and do you want to run into the expense of printing 100,000 copies of this? I am for economy.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot escape the conviction that those who oppose this resolution fear the truth.

The American people are entitled to have the truth and the facts. For the sake of our democracy we must be prepared to defend ourselves from all dangers, from the left and from the right.

I am opposed to all isms—unless it be Americanism.

Our Government has stood us well for 170 years. We must preserve it; and to preserve our Government and our way of life we must make the American people as familiar with the dangers from fascism—which, I repeat, is a far greater menace than communism—as they are with the dangers of communism. I am sure that the defenders and advocates of fascism or of nazism do not fully realize the dangers.

#### FASCISM IS SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN

Can anyone contend that fascism is not subversive and un-American?

There are certain shrewd gentlemen who, to serve dangerous interests of their own, wave the red herring of communism across the fascist trail to try to throw us off the scent; we must not be misled or turned aside.

If Members will but familiarize themselves with the authentic reports of our own committees, and of Senate committees, and read for themselves what the Nazis and the Fascists have done and are doing and are still planning; or if they will study such books as Darel McConkey's *Out of Your Pocket* and Howard Armbruster's *Treason's Peace* or the

study of cartels by the Twentieth Century Fund, they could not and would not be stopped from exposing the hidden scourge of fascism and its accompanying evils of monopoly and cartel.

#### EVEN IN OUR OWN COUNTRY

They should learn for themselves what is even now transpiring in Germany and in all European countries where the twin criminal ideologies of nazism and fascism are being nurtured by fanatics for future renaissance, and of how, under cover of base ideological propaganda, there is an international conspiracy to revive and reestablish the world-wide cartels, even here in our own country.

They would not then oppose, but would welcome, the printing of this slim pamphlet by the millions.

Working under cover all over the world, the Nazi-Fascists cannot even wait until the peace treaties are signed to show their hands.

Look at the newspaper headlines of the last month or two.

I select just a few at random to illustrate what I mean. A United Press story from Paris, dated July 1, is headed: "Details of French Rightist plot for march on Paris revealed."

The Washington Post put this headline on another United Press story from Rome dated June 22: "Sudden raids on Fascist lairs net hundreds in Italy, Sicily."

Over a June 14 United Press story from Paris summarizing the report of the International Committee for Study of European Questions the same paper carried this headline: "Sabotage in occupied zones—Argentina is called center of three-continent Nazi ring."

The Chicago Daily News of June 26 had this headline over a byline story by Wallace R. Deuel, the widely known reporter and correspondent: "Germans organize to win sympathy."

Fascism is in action nearer home. The Chicago Sun had this headline on a story from Buenos Aires by Virginia Prewett on June 14: "Argentina takes control of stock market dealings."

#### AMERICAN FASCISM IN ACTION

Now I am going to quote at length from an editorial column by Peter Edson, an ardent young Republican, who is chief of the Washington bureau of Roy Howard's Newspaper Enterprise Association. This column appeared June 10. I omit only those paragraphs which are no longer timely.

#### AMERICAN FASCISM IN ACTION

(By Peter Edson)

Six months ago if anyone had said that the United States was leaning toward fascism you could have called him crazy.

On the surface of American life today, however, there are a few events which may be worth a second look in the microscope, to see if they contain the germs of growing fascism. They are in no way related. But, taken together, perhaps they indicate a trend in thinking.

The recent Supreme Court decision approving the FBI search without warrant of the home of an Oklahoma forger is perfectly good Fascist doctrine. Hitler did it—searching and seizing the homes, property, and persons of suspect anti-Nazis without due process of law.

#### LABOR BILL, TOO

Some portions of the Taft-Hartley labor bill which may later be interpreted as a denial of constitutional rights show Fascist inclinations.

Under certain conditions, employees may be denied their right to reemployment. Supervisory and professional employees are denied the right to be represented by labor organizations of their own choosing.

Sections of the law making new definitions of unfair labor practices are open to a number of interpretations which may be considered unnecessarily repressive.

#### IT'S A STEP

This new labor law is in no sense comparable to the Hitler and Mussolini labor codes, which virtually enslaved German and Italian workers and broke their unions. Nevertheless, to the degree this law makes a beginning toward such action, it bears watching. The tests will come in how the courts rule on its meaning.

Similarly many other measures now waiting final action in Congress have totalitarian leanings. The bill to wipe out free enterprise competition and create one "chosen instrument" air line to have a monopoly on United States international air commerce is an example.

#### MORE ATTACKS

In any number of bills proposed this year there is a tendency to take away protection of the consumer and the little man, giving special interests and opportunity for exploitation. So the housing and price controls went off. Thus the regulatory functions of the Federal Power Commission over natural gas, of the Bureau of Reclamation over public power, of the Federal Communications Commission over radio in the public interest, are all under attack.

In business itself the trend toward concentration of productive capacity in the hands of big companies represents a threat to small business, a shift toward the Nazi-type monopoly.

#### MONOPOLY HUNGER

The desire of the insurance, railroad, and other elements of business to be freed from the antitrust laws is significantly Fascist in its plea for special privilege.

In its foreign policy the United States is suspect. What are the implications of this new recognition of Peron's definitely Fascist regime in the Argentine? Does aid to Turkey and Greece mean bolstering up the dictatorial governments of Athens and Ankara? There seems to be too much Hitlerian belief in the inevitability of another war. What's needed is more preparedness for peace.

#### THE STUDY

Viewing all these and other events like them, Democratic Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, asked the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress to make a study on fascism in action in the United States today. A short time ago it was finished. PATMAN asked that 100,000 copies be printed for the public.

There was precedent for this in the publication last year of *Communism in Action*, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service at the request of Representative EVERETT M. DIRKSEN (Republican, Illinois).

\* \* \* The fact that censorship of this document is being considered sounds bad. Political censorship of this kind is fascism in itself. PATMAN's full text should be made available, to let the public decide what censorship is needed.

\* \* \* Representative PATMAN asked for an investigation of fascism last March. Nothing has been done in that direction. \* \* \*

When Gov. Harold Stassen interviewed Stalin in Moscow, the Russian dictator declared that he could see no difference be-

tween a Republican and a Democrat. He may be right.

But the answer to that one is that in the United States it's hard to tell the difference between a Communist and a Fascist. One is just as dangerous to the American form of government as the other.

#### HITLER IDEAS STILL LIVE

Mr. Speaker, wherever there are newspaper and magazine reporters they are writing about fascism in action.

Hitler lives.

The mere fact that Adolf Hitler, the man, died in the flaming ruins of Berlin did not mean the end of the Nazi ideologies.

The undignified execution of Benito Mussolini did not automatically do away with statism. The death of Goebbels and Goering did not bring about an end to the vicious principles and practices of propaganda which they raised to the level of an exact science.

#### FEW TO FIGHT FASCISM

The voices raised against the dictatorship and invisible government of big business, against the Fascist concepts of statism, of race and religious hatreds, of police rule, are few and small and weak.

Some gentlemen have asked the names of Fascist organizations here. I gave them some on June 13. I shall provide more soon. But not all Fascists are banded together in clubs or organizations.

Fascism is a state of mind, a series of oppressive ideas. I hope this Congress will not refuse to print 1,425 copies of this neutral and scholarly treatise on Fascism in Action. It is inconceivable to me that we should have hesitated so long, after having printed 375,000 copies of Communism in Action with no hesitancy whatever.

I think some members of that committee merely have been blinded by their almost psychopathic fear of communism to the fact that American democracy, as a way of life, is unique in the world today.

#### WE FOUGHT THE AXIS

Perhaps the gentlemen have forgotten that we are still technically in a state of war with the Fascist Axis. No peace treaty has been signed with Japan; no peace treaty has or can be signed with Germany because there is no responsible German Government. Hitler preferred to destroy his nation and himself rather than to give up his dream of world conquest.

Is Hitler to be victorious in death? Are his ideas to be allowed to race rampant throughout the length and breadth of our Nation without exposure, without criticism, without comment?

#### DICTIONARIES DEFINE FASCISM

I call upon the Members of this House to consult their dictionaries. In Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, fifth edition, published in 1947, I find this definition of fascism:

Any strongly centralized autocratic national regime with severely nationalistic policies, exercising regimentation of industry, commerce, and finance, rigid censorship, and forcible suppression of opposition.

The very same dictionary defines the Falange as a Spanish Fascist organiza-

tion. Yet we are told with pride that the most prominent American apologist of the Franco Falangist government has appeared before the committee on resolutions of the Republican Party to state his views. Is that the reason that the resolution to print Fascism in Action has been so long delayed? Is there fear that Fascism in Action will offend Merwyn K. Hart and the big business sympathizers of Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Hirohito?

#### CORPORATIVE STATE IS FASCIST

Let me quote again from Webster's Collegiate Dictionary the definition of the corporative state:

Centering supreme authority in one corporate body made up of representatives of key corporations (employer-employee bodies) exercising regimentation severally in industry, business, banking, labor, and all other entities of the body politic; as, the Italian corporative state.

The Spanish state might also have been mentioned.

Have we not advanced already too far on the dangerous road toward a corporative state? The National Association of Manufacturers, through its lobbyists and lawyers, is writing the labor laws passed by this Republican Congress. The publications of the United States Chamber of Commerce, prejudiced and distorted as they are, are purchased by the Navy Department as official textbooks.

Mr. Speaker, we must turn back. We must find again the straight and narrow road of democratic faith and democratic action. We must act in the interest of all the people. We must not lose the peace.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the charge is made that the left-wing newspapers are for this resolution. Newspapers like the Washington Post, and the St. Louis Star-Times, and papers published all over the Nation support this. They are not left-wing newspapers. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has had a lot about it.

It has been said that the only information contained in it is about fascism in Europe. It is exactly the same as the booklet Communism in Europe. One offsets the other. It was prepared by the same staff. It is said that the cost would be \$1,680 for the first thousand. It is charged that it would cost too much. While the first thousand would be printed, then thousands of other copies would be printed and be sold by the Government Printing Office at a good profit just like other documents have been sold.

I have been opposed to both communism and fascism for 25 years. It is not new with me. I have never denounced one without denouncing the other. One is approaching us from the left and the other is approaching us from the right. We should have full information about both ideologies. This document has not been censored to the extent that anything essential has been taken out of it. The committee did not insist on censorship notwithstanding reports to the contrary. Everything that is essential is in this document. Everything that was

essential to it in the beginning is in it now and will be in it when it is printed. This document has been well prepared by well-qualified, reputable people under the direction of one of the greatest men of this country, Dr. Ernest Griffith, Director of the Legislative Reference Service. It sets out the truth. It states the truth insofar as the Legislative Reference Service has been able to compile the truth. We should not be afraid of the truth. We should want to know about the earmarks of fascism in order that we may identify Fascist organizations in this country. It is necessary that we fight both communism and fascism. We have printed the book on communism. Now let us vote "Yea" on the question that is now coming up to print this document as a House document. Then a request will be made for extra copies. You will have the printed copies. If you do not want extra copies made they will not be printed. You will see the printed copy first, in advance. So I ask you to vote against the motion to recommit and vote "Yes" on the passage of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS moves to recommit the resolution to the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi to recommit the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 116, noes 117.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Speaker appointed Mr. CORBETT and Mr. WILLIAMS to act as tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 115, noes 124.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next and on Monday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on both days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

## COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 4102.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## THE ALASKA SHIPPING SITUATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Alaska I desire to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL], distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, for appointing a special committee to inquire into the relations of the United States Maritime Commission with the Alaska shipping situation and, generally, to review that situation. The members of this special committee are Mr. ALLEN of California, Mr. BRADLEY of California, Mr. TOLLEFSON of Washington, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, and Mr. HAVENNER of California. I welcome their official entry into a field which fairly cries for investigation.

Most of us are so constituted that we would rather praise than condemn. Perhaps that is especially so when the criticism has to do with the operations of an executive agency of our Government. But the time has come—probably it is overdue—when this House should learn some of the facts relating to the Maritime Commission and Alaska shipping.

I observe that the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman WEICHEL, is unconvinced that the operations of the Maritime Commission are all they should be. Similarly, I note that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has called the attention of the House to

the practices of that Commission. It is time the House heard about them and for my part I intend here and now to give the House some facts regarding the Maritime Commission and its mismanagement and lack of vision in the Alaska shipping service.

Alaskans have a great pride of place. They are proud of the fact that they live in the northernmost land under the American flag and that they are pioneers in the development of our last great frontier. They are of sturdy stock, assembled from each of our 48 States, and well equipped by reason of mental and physical capacity to surmount the difficulties which are always encountered in a new country.

They are used to meeting emergencies, battling them, and overcoming them. They have created typical American communities, overcoming every obstacle that nature set up against them. They have conquered nature, but now they are confronted by a new and more urgent emergency which is the handiwork of man. They have been assailed by fellow Americans and they have desperate need to draw upon all their reserves.

Living in an area where the maritime rates have always been higher than elsewhere, Alaskans had pretty well adjusted themselves to a condition of legalized plunder; since man is always hopeful and optimistic, they had hoped and expected that which was bad would eventually become better as population increased and as Alaskans became more able to raise their voices effectively. In this hope and in this expectation they simply did not comprehend the strength and the ruthlessness of their masters, the Seattle operators of the steamship lines which serve the Territory.

Alaska has always been a country of high prices. A high price is historically to be expected in a pioneer community. And Alaska, while on the mainland of North America, is with respect to transportation practically in the same position as an island. All its goods that are not produced locally—and such production is only a fraction of 1 percent—must be transported by steamship to Alaska ports. In this transportation Alaskans have always been used to paying terrifically high rates. In the spring of 1947 they found themselves compelled to pay more—much more—than they ever have before and they find this unjust increase made legal by an edict of a United States Government agency.

When the people of a Territory fall even to be heard by an agency because of the arbitrary and capricious exercise of power vested in an agency, they have no recourse but to plead their case before Congress. Today there is little effective redress in the courts against the tyranny, the whimsicality, the bias, and the fears of a quasi-judicial agency. It is to be regretted that appeal from administrative law is a virtual myth, but it is so. Only the most outrageous exercise of discretion, only the most transparent prejudice, only the self-confessed bias of such agencies can be corrected by the courts.

I do not have any expectation that in this instance the plight of 90,000 Alaskans can or will become the concern of

the chastened and restricted courts or a busy Congress. The Congress has already attended, as far as has seemed proper, to the legacy the war left to the peacetime shipping problems of Alaska. But I do want every Congressman, particularly every Congressman who has been baffled in bringing congressional attention to bear on his local problem, to note and to long remember what I say here. It has no bearing on his immediate frustrations, but it is replete with significance for a Congress too busy to pay attention to the arbitrary and capricious doings of governmental agencies in behalf of special interests, and it is overfull with significance that no Delegate can effectively shout down, give pause to, or strike fear into the hearts of Commission officers unless Congress can disengage itself from concerns of national and world-wide moment to rebuke and reprimand an agency for its whimsicality, its ruthlessness, and its utter disregard of the public interest. It is for reasons such as the one I would like to relate, that all Territories and possessions feel themselves like political zombies, of the living political world but politically without soul and without status to render their opinions in a forceful and vital and compelling manner.

The facts of this specific complaint are quite beyond dispute. After making incredible wartime profits—incredible compared with their prewar earnings and incredible compared with their insignificant investments in ships afloat, three Alaska carriers decided to try to perpetuate those earning levels by crying to the high heavens and to all the world that would gullibly listen in a hearing before the United States Maritime Commission at Seattle in November 1945 that they needed the stupendous increase of 118 percent over and above their prewar rates for their postwar carrying between Seattle and Alaska. The 118 percent on top of their prewar rates, then and now, mile for mile, the highest of any shipping trade in the United States coastal, intercoastal, and offshore areas. The carriers attributed the need for this fantastic increase to the new wage-and-price levels emerging from the war, factors the assessment of which everyone was open-minded about, but also to extremely costly and irresponsible labor practices growing up during the war—some of which could inconceivably be established but others of which were open to question.

The hearings in Seattle were so suddenly scheduled and so unbelievably one-sided that a delay in establishing a rebuttal was wrung from the United States Maritime Commission. Moreover, the special examiner appointed for this proceeding was removed. Government economists, accountants, and lawyers from the Territory and from Washington were put to work to reason why such astronomical increases on top of already astronomical rates were required. They soon found that the Seattle hearings had revealed only an excited estimate of nonsense respecting both revenues and costs. Some of the most corrosive and scathing criticism ever offered by the Government in a public hearing sent the carriers into Coventry. The Government's

findings were so compelling that the United States Maritime Commission quashed the carrier's arguments in toto as literally out of the world of reality and probability.

Probably no proceeding before the United States Maritime Commission had ever been laughed down and ridiculed down to proper proportions so thoroughly and devastatingly as was the case in United States Maritime Commission Docket 641. Even Washington, the most sophisticated of all cities in appreciating good though ineffectual raids on the purse of the public, chuckled. Even the Maritime Commission chuckled. And, chuckling, it dismissed the lugubrious plea of the carriers and bade them try again. Not only was the special examiner removed but also the principal witness for the principal carrier was discharged. The \$8,000,000 increase that was declared in Seattle to be necessary was a clearly unsupportable figure. Nobody believed it was necessary. Nobody could show that it was necessary. It was the wolf cry of enterprisers all of a sudden frightened by the prospect of peacetime shrinkage of their wartime profits. And I repeat: Their cry begot merely ridicule in Washington, ridicule from the United States Maritime Commission, ridicule from the Department of Commerce, ridicule from OPA, and ridicule and scorn from the Territory of Alaska. All were willing to concede a need for other maritime carriers for increases 25 to 50 percent over prewar rates for an unsubsidized operation—but no more. Other carriers faced labor problems. Other carriers faced a new price level. But Alaska carriers faced no competition. And they were content to cry wolf. They were content to wear down Washington and to wear down the Territory of Alaska by protracted negotiations, in the hope that weariness of the entire problem would eventually, by default if not by merit, win them what they wanted.

After the United States Maritime Commission was compelled by sheer force of logic to clinch their pleadings as unworthy of entertainment, the carriers pleaded the need for relief from Congress. There were groups for believing that they needed relief from Congress. The economic consequences of the War Shipping Administration's operation of offshore fleets seemed to be bad. Moreover, the war had, by reason of requiring shipping in unaccustomed routes and under adverse weather and enemy-action conditions, led to a severe depletion of the fleets customarily assigned to the Alaska trade. Alaska needed ships which the carriers did not have. Alaska also needed ships to operate at a rate something less than 218 percent of prewar rates. The Congress therefore provided that Alaska residents need not pay the full apparent costs of shipping for the year 1947-48, by providing that the capital costs of the fleet necessary for the 1947-48 operation would in large part be absorbed by the Federal Government as a proper Federal expense for the costs directly attributable to the exigencies of war, costs which were not shipping costs proper, but rather war-

engendered costs. None of the carriers had the requisite capacity for meeting the needs of the Alaska trade. One operator had no ships; one had a hopelessly inadequate vessel, inadequate by prewar and postwar standards, and one operator had a fleet down from a prewar score of ships to five vessels for postwar—as sorry a fleet of "cattle boats" as ever put to sea under the American flag. One of their ships was 77 years old, built when our grandfathers were young—indeed when Ulysses Grant was President.

The carriers had no claim upon Alaska. Theirs was, at most, a vested interest in the past, a well-rewarded interest. They could not supply the needs of Alaska if they would—not without Government ships.

These were gladly supplied in 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947 by the Federal Government. War and the habits of wartime supplied the tonnage needed in Alaska. The Territory was a bastion of defense and a vast loading field for aviaional movement. It was the military support of the west coast. It was the lend-lease life line to Russia.

Its civil population increased between 1942 and 1943 by over 20 percent. Its military population much more. Congress properly recognized the growth of the Territory and its increasing importance as to military area by granting in effect a subsidy on Alaska shipping for 1946 when the other Territories reverted to private operating and for 1947-48 when Alaska should find its bearings for the postwar period. This congressional policy was established by joint resolution in February 1947.

Between 1945 and that date the Territorial Government and the carriers had been in formal communication, in the hope, on the part of the former at least, that protracted and expensive hearing might be avoided and yet that a satisfactory meeting of minds might be effected.

The Territory in these meetings protested that the gross discriminations between the prewar rates payable by the canned fish industry and the year round residents of Alaska should be abolished. The Congress should know that the fish industry in Alaska is a 4 months' industry, but it requires ships on hand the year around for its needs these few months a year; yet it paid before the war about half the rates for freight which residents of Alaska paid. What could be fair about this? The Territory conceded that the welfare of the canned fish industry was important to the Territory's welfare, but it could not in reason or conscience concede that rates which bore so heavily upon its year round business and consumers in order to offset preferential rates for the industry were either fair or in the public interest.

The Territory's plea fell on the deafest of deaf ears. The carriers proceeded to file tariffs in excess of prewar tariffs, which not only preserved but enhanced the degree of discrimination which existed before the war. This filing took place shortly after passing of the joint resolution authorizing a temporary subsidy for the Alaska shipping service. The

carriers consulted no single person in the Territorial government about either the general increase involved or about specific rate increases for freight or passengers. They merely dumped into the laps of the Commission a proposal to increase 1941 freight rates by 66 percent—a 66 percent increase even though there are no capital costs to be reckoned for Government-owned ships. If capital costs were to be covered, the general increase would, by comparison with the 66 percent increase, have to be in the neighborhood of the absurd increase proposed at Seattle in November 1945. Thus it is as if the Government had never rejected the first proposal, as if it had never spent any time and money pointing up the invalidity of it, as if it had never been laughed down.

The 66-percent increase was, as I say, dumped into the lap of the Maritime Commission to be effective 30 days thereafter. The Territory immediately began to prepare a protest, not the usual perfunctory protest and not the merely rhetorical and emotional type of protest, but a thoughtful analysis based on recent cost revenue and tariff experience in the Alaska trade. The analysis showed that the rates proposed were more discriminatory than ever, that the trade was wastefully overserved, that some ships would be making Alaska voyages only one-fifth filled, that the proposed rates would yield \$4,000,000 in excess of legitimate costs and profits.

The Territory presented a carefully weighed brief to the Maritime Commission. It showed that in some instances rates for north-bound goods to residents of Alaska were twice the rates for identical goods south-bound. Between ports it showed the clearest kind of discrimination. The proposed rates would permit a carrier to send out a vessel virtually empty just to compete with another carrier. Why not? The public will pay for it out of excessive rates. The Territory could no more imagine the necessity for such extremely wasteful competition than residents of Washington could imagine the need for running three busses loaded and the next seven empty. The Territory could no more imagine the necessity for such scheduling than the Congress could imagine the need for running three planes out of Washington filled and the next seven planes empty.

But these findings were old stuff. For a year and a half the Maritime Commission has been told about them. The Territory merely brought the statistics on them up to date and prepared its brief with all possible speed.

In the halls of the Maritime Commission, when it was learned that the Territory would protest, there was heard the conjecture, "What would the Territory do for service if the rates were suspended and the carriers refused, as they had threatened if suspension were ordered, to operate?" It became obvious that the Commission entertained threats. In fact, the Territory learned very shortly that threats make rates. Textbooks should be brought up to date.

The Territory's petition for suspension was summarily denied. No reason for the

decision was given. The Territory's petition for oral argument was not even acknowledged. Clearly it was up against a stone wall. The carriers who had assembled here for argument of the proposal smugly zipped their brief cases closed and sauntered off. While we in blind innocence awaited a decision, the carriers had already announced to the Seattle papers that the petition of the Territory had been denied. Not until we got this news did the Maritime Commission inform us that we were not to have a day in court.

Now, with the zealous protection of the Maritime Commission, the carriers have one hand in the Federal Treasury for their capital costs and their other hand in the pockets of Alaska for \$4,000,000 more than they justly deserve—\$4,000,000 on top of \$12,000,000 of cost-covering revenue, that is, rates 33⅓ percent too high. Four million dollars—twice the cost of statehood some people assert Alaska cannot afford—for 90,000 people to pay. And Alaska is now paying it because administrative caprice and arbitrariness upset all the rules of rate making.

Where is the public interest in this case? It was not even heard, let alone considered. If the Commission seeks to excuse its conduct because of the carriers' threat to suspend operations, then it acknowledges that threats make rates. The Territory was prepared to endure a cessation of service rather than stand for the legalized plunder involved in these new rates. It had only recently endured a 105-day strike, and the Maritime Commission sat on its hands waiting for carriers and union leaders to exhaust each other and the public. The Territory was prepared to withstand threats and attempted blackmail. It knew that it had to.

Of course, the Commission holds out the consolation cup, a little cup or an empty cup, depending upon how you see it. It offers us the opportunity to participate in a general investigation to see whether the new rates are lawful. This is like permitting crime to go on while the courts are hearing why it should not go on. It is a small consolation for the bitter pill the Commission has prescribed for the Territory. For a year and a half the assertions of the carriers have been shown up as gross exaggeration and fantasy. Then, all of a sudden, those assertions are acted upon as true and are to be swallowed up as part of a pretended emergency. Speed of action becomes necessary, so necessary that the carriers can name the rate level they want, the impact of the rates on users and ports, the scheduling they want, and the number of ships they will take from the Government. In effect, they, and not the Commission, have abrogated to themselves the right to decide what is fair, what is equitable, and what the public interest is. All, of course, on an ex parte basis. And the carriers return to Seattle to resume their wasteful ways at rates they had not expected to get and had not shown any need for.

It will be alleged that the Territory will have its day in court; in other words, it will be able to participate in a general rate investigation. But what does this mean? Substantially it means that for

the next 6 to 12 months the present rates will be in effect while the need for them is being explored. Prices in Alaska meanwhile are going up because freight rates have gone up. The people of Alaska will pay and pay and pay while judgment is taken.

But the principal owner of the two important fleets of Alaska is a large-scale cannery. He has seen to it that he and his fellow cannerymen will pay only a small part of the increases, and he has seen to it without any embarrassment. The unnecessary \$4,000,000 will be a buffer against all conceivable kinds of loss, but they will not come in any substantial measure from him or the cannery industry. He does not have to justify a rate for canned fish south-bound from Kodiak to Seattle, one-half the rate for dry groceries north-bound to Kodiak. He makes up his own mind what the public interest is, files the rates he wants, and in effect gets those rates for this year's operation—all that without a hearing. If this is rate making in the public interest, then why bother with the deceptive trappings of a regulatory body? Private determinations make public rates. Why pretend otherwise? Why mislead the public that Alaska's ship rates are this year the results of regulation? No argument, however clever, can make it seem so. No metaphysic can show it to be so.

Moreover, lest any stone be left unturned in behalf of the carriers, the Commission has gone to the incredible length of providing, over the protest of the Territory, that the subsidy approved by Congress may be awarded only to the carriers who pretend to have a first claim on the Alaska trade. No examination of their efficiency is made. No exploration of the waste of having three or four carriers, instead of one, overlapping one another's voyages is conducted. No limit is put upon the number of sailings they may wastefully indulge. The charm of their vested interests overrides such practical considerations. Whether other carriers could do a better job or secure a better balance of traffic—as the Territory knows to be so—is no matter to disturb the Commission.

Congress did not pass an exclusive subsidy for the benefit of the Alaska carriers or for the benefit of the Alaska canneries, but for the benefit of the Alaska public. The Commission, however, believes that what it says a resolution means is what Congress meant. And the Commission says that the subsidy is exclusively not for one carrier, not for efficient carriers, but for the Alaska carriers. It wraps itself up in the pious garb of economy and says that any other decision would result in wasteful use of Government property. It does not dare, however, seriously to examine the fact that in the past 2 years ship after ship at public and Federal expense left for Alaska using only 20 to 30 percent of voyage capacity. Ask any seagoing carrier how typical this scheduling is. Of course, it will occur now and then, but if it became typical the American merchant marine would quickly disappear from the high seas. Foreign competition would quickly see to that. But in Alaska we are helpless against this inefficiency.

The Alaska carriers say that this intolerable loading factor is now necessary because they have been accustomed to it. They do not know how to increase it and they do not want to learn. Paper, pulp, and limestone cannot leave Alaska and British Columbia because their rates are too high. And their rates are too high because paper, pulp, and limestone are not part of their southbound load. They never were! Therefore, they never should be!

So much for this complaint. What can be done about it? Not much in this instance, I fear. The process of government, good and bad government, work too slow for immediate correction. But sooner or later the Congress must come to realize that regulatory powers over rates must be divested from agencies given the responsibility of promoting railroading, trucking, aviation, and merchant marine. Agencies cannot promote these activities with one hand and protect the general public interest with the other hand. It cannot be done. These regulatory powers were once delegated to agencies as public defenders. That concept was soon supplanted by the assumption that the agencies had a quasi judicial function. But even this concept goes by the board in an instance such as I have related, and the responsible agency becomes an abettor and a devil's advocate for private interests. Sooner or later this must be corrected. The sooner it is the better for the public interest.

Any hearings held in the future will be long drawn out, and even the most optimistic of us would scarcely hope that a decision will be reached before the provisions of the joint resolution expire in June 1948. In the meantime, Alaskans will be assessed these terrifically high rates. Some will simply be unable to meet the high cost of living and will return to the States.

And this at a time when the National Government is demanding settlement of Alaska. Again it is the case of the left hand undoing that which has been accomplished by the right. And, curiously enough, the Federal Government, which has furnished ships at practically no cost and exclusively to the Seattle operators, will, as the chief shipper to the Territory, have to pay the lion's share of the new rates. It does not make sense. It cannot make sense, because there is no logic behind it.

#### SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 8. An act to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 208. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 364. An act to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment, and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 409. An act for the relief of Milan Jan-drich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 714. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1043. An act for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1180. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1249. An act authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1317. An act to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1350. An act to authorize relief of accountable officers of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1402. An act to authorize the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia to establish bylaws governing the election of their vestrymen; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1442. An act to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1462. An act to authorize the official reporters of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to collect fees for transcripts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1508. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1515. An act to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for membership by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to provide for returns of Italian property in the United

States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution favoring a fair representation of American small businessmen on policy-making bodies created by Executive appointment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of William E. Borah; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 811. An act for the relief of J. F. Powers;

H. R. 3333. An act to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes; and

H. R. 3861. An act to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 665. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pretenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho;

S. 686. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school buildings in Owyhee, Nev.;

S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate;

S. 816. An act to repeal the Post Roads Act of 1866, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946;

S. 1231. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the issuance of certain public improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 1421. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 3, 1947:

H. R. 4031. An act making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

On July 7, 1947:

H. R. 195. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Alaska to the city of Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 325. An act to transfer Blair County, Pa., from the middle judicial district of

Pennsylvania to the western judicial district of Pennsylvania;

H. R. 599. An act declaring Kenduskeag Stream, Penobscot County, Maine, to be a nonnavigable waterway;

H. R. 770. An act for the relief of Norman Abbott;

H. R. 837. An act for the relief of the estate of Abram Banta Bogert;

H. R. 959. An act to amend section 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1513. An act for the relief of John C. Garrett;

H. R. 1610. An act to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.;

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of A. J. Davis, Mrs. Lorene Griffin, Earle Griffin, and Harry Musgrove;

H. R. 1866. An act for the relief of Paul Goodman;

H. R. 1893. An act to authorize the sale of the bed of E Street SW., between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1945. An act to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), 3044 (b), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1946. An act to amend sections 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 2302. An act for the relief of New Jersey, Indiana & Illinois Railroad;

H. R. 2470. An act to authorize the establishment of a band in the Metropolitan Police force;

H. R. 3072. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost of for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building;

H. R. 3235. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings;

H. R. 3251. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3311. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3515. An act to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to corruptly influence participants or officials in contests of skill, speed, strength, or endurance, and to provide a penalty therefor; and

H. R. 3547. An act to authorize funds for ceremonies in the District of Columbia.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 9, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

899. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Thirty-third Annual Report, covering operations of the Federal Reserve System during the calendar year 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

900. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting

a report pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 12, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

901. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

902. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the report and recommendations of the Joint Philippine-American Finance Commission, dated June 7, 1947, and a technical memorandum entitled "Philippine Economic Development" (H. Doc. No. 390); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 274. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3952, a bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 803). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 275. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 222, joint resolution terminating consumer credit controls; without amendment (Rept. No. 804). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1809. A bill to facilitate the use and occupancy of national forest lands, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 805). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HORAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4106. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 806). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4071. A bill to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 807). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3889. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases; with amendments (Rept. No. 808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CORBETT: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 83. Resolution to provide for the printing of a documented study and analyses of Fascism in Action as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 809). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3862. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse; without amendment (Rept. No. 810). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4106. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 4107. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4108. A bill to reduce in area the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 4109. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4110. A bill to amend title 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work and the more complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges," approved June 29, 1935 (the Bankhead-Jones Act); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 4111. A bill authorizing the construction of flood-control works on the Little Sioux River and its tributaries in Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 4112. A bill to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the national weather service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4113. A bill to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4114. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution authorizing the President to approve the trusteeship agreement for the territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. Res. 276. Resolution to request the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate action to prevent further damage to crops as a result of the use of the weed killer known as 2,4-D; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take steps necessary to authorize immediate development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to enable the several States and Territories to finance the administration of their unemployment-insurance systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 4115. A bill to quiet title and possession with respect to certain land in the town of Cheverly, Prince Georges County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 4116. A bill for the relief of W. S. Burleson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 4117. A bill for the relief of Devi Dja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 4118. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

729. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Hudson County Bar Association, expressing opposition to passage of H. R. 1639, the Jennings bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

730. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Martha Moffitt, Sanford, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

731. Also, petition of Mrs. Alice R. Praster and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

732. Also, petition of A. M. Keller, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

733. Also, petition of James R. Allen, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting the removal of the Attorney General of the United States from office for failure to take action on complaints filed with the Department of Justice over a period of several months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

734. Also, petition of Mrs. C. Cody, Jacksonville, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

735. Also, petition of Henry C. Curtis and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

736. Also, petition of Orville Bright and others, petitioning consideration of their res-

olution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

737. Also, petition of Mrs. Jean Head and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 9, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, July 7, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Albert Joseph McCartney, D. D., minister emeritus, Covenant-First Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Once more, our Father, we would begin the legislative day with Thee. As we pause for this reverential moment, may we be still and know that Thou art God. We invoke Thy blessing upon the Members of the Senate, whether present or absent. Give us strength for our burdens, wisdom for our responsibilities, insight for our times, charity for our speech, courage for our convictions, and unfaltering faith in Thy divine leadership. So may the safety, honor, and general welfare of our Nation be advanced that happiness, peace, and prosperity may be established upon the sure foundation of truth and justice, virtue and piety.

In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 8, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### REPORT ON ALASKA OCEAN TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to certain ocean transportation service to and from Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Nu Beta Epsilon National Legal Fraternity in convention assembled on March 28, 1947, at Chicago, Ill., endorsing

the efforts of Congress and the President toward the immediate immigration of displaced Jews into Palestine, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### FELICITATIONS FROM ARGENTINE SENATE ON ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a radiogram from J. H. Quijano, president, and Alberto H. Reales, secretary, of the Argentine Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 5, 1947.

PRESIDENT OF THE ILLUSTRIOUS SENATE, WASHINGTON:

I have the honor to transmit to you, Mr. President, and through you to that illustrious Senate the feelings of friendship and solidarity which I express in the name of the Argentine Senate and in my own name on the occasion of the one hundred and seventy-first anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of that great Nation.

J. H. QUIJANO,

President of the Senate.

ALBERTO H. REALES,  
Secretary.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3055. A bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose business or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 463).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3215. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army and the Medical Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 464).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3678. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 465).

By Mr. YOUNG, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3993. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 467).

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3131. A bill to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; without amendment; and

H. R. 3744. A bill to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia; without amendment.

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1481. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; without amendment; and

H. R. 1448. A bill to amend section 7 of an act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for

the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes, approved July 1, 1902; with an amendment (Rept. No. 466).

#### REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,  
July 8, 1947.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each staff member employed by it for the period from January 3, 1947, to June 30, 1947, together with the funds appropriated to and expended by it:

James M. Kendall, clerk; salary, \$7,075.06; Joycette K. Jones, clerk; salary, \$6,026.72.

Funds appropriated, \$10,000; funds expended, \$1,780.38.

ARTHUR CAPPER, Chairman.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 9, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 665. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for money stolen or obtained through false pretenses from them while they were on duty at the United States naval training station, Farragut, Idaho;

S. 686. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school buildings in Owyhee, Nev.;

S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate;

S. 816. An act to repeal the Post Roads Act of 1866, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946;

S. 1231. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1316. An act to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes;

S. 1420. An act to authorize the issuance of certain public-improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 1421. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina introduced Senate bill 1587, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which was referred to the